NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DLXXVII.

DECEMBER, 1904.

A CENTURY OF POLITICS

BY WILLIAM A. DUNNING, PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

I.

When Louisiana was acquired by the United States, the politics of the world was centred about a single nation, and the politics of this nation was centred about a single individual. France and Napoleon epitomized the dominant principles of the day; revolutionized France meant liberty and equality, the rights of man, national democracy; Napoleon, at this stage of his career, meant the resistless armed might of democratic propagandism. Before the enthusiasm of the French nation and the genius of their chosen leader, the principles, the practices and the men of the old régime vanished from Western Continental Europe. Only in Russia and in the British Isles did Conservatism find a secure refuge, and from these points of support, with the principles and material resources of England as its chief dependence, it waged unrelenting war on all things French and all things Napoleonic, and in the end it was triumphant.

With 1815 came the termination of the long wars; the smoke and shouting of battle passed away, and the readjustment of institutions and political systems began. Reaction was manifest everywhere; the dogmas and the men that for nearly twenty-five years had cowered in the remotest and obscurest hiding-places of

Copyright, 1904, by The North American Review Publishing Company. All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Continent now assumed control of political life, and a war of extermination was entered upon against everything that had been identified with the Revolution. But the work of the French Republic and the Napoleonic Empire had been too thoroughly done throughout Western and Central Europe to permit of ready eradication, even by the drastic methods employed by Metternich and his satellites. Liberalism, proscribed and hunted by the triumphant Powers, lived nevertheless, and resisted its adversaries with the weapons that were nearest at hand—conspiracy, assassination, insurrection—as well as by ceaseless agitation and debate, so far as these were permitted in practical politics; and at last, but only when the middle of the century had been reached, it had secured a definitive triumph throughout the better part of Europe. After the revolutionary wave of 1848, the prevailing governmental systems, as well as the prevailing beliefs in both scientific and popular thought, expressed, with more or less completeness, the principles for which the Liberals had contended. And, far more fully than anywhere in Europe, these principles pervaded the government and the general life of that growing people across the Atlantic, whose development had already begun to make them a factor of large significance in the affairs of the civilized world.

This conflict between Liberalism and Conservatism, then, may be taken as marking in a general way a period in nineteenth-century politics. In the affairs of every European country, the struggle for the realization of Liberal ideas furnished the most conspicuous incidents. France was the recognized leader and gave the impulse to all Europe in this respect; and the history of her party politics is merely a recital of the strife of Liberalism and Conservatism. Spain and the Italian states exhibited a series of transformations in governmental institutions with the same division as the basis. The German states experienced many vicissitudes of agitation and insurrection; but the hand of Metternich was strong in Central Europe, and, while Liberalism got a footing in some of the smaller states, the time of the greater did not come until 1848; and even then the success of the Liberals was but temporary in Austria and greatly qualified in Prussia. England felt the effect of the spirit of the times in the great struggles for Catholic Emancipation and Parliamentary Reform, and in the abortive movement of the Chartists. Even

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia had a little experience of uprising for Liberal government in 1825 at the accession of Nicholas, and a very serious experience with the combination of Liberalism and Nationalism in the Polish war of 1830. And, finally, the United States exhibited the influence of the *Zeitgeist* by the transition from the Jeffersonian to the Jacksonian type of democracy.

Assuming, then, that the struggle between Liberalism and Conservatism was the characteristic mark of the practical politics of the period extending to the middle of the century, let us consider what were the principles of political science that were involved in the struggle and its result.

Fundamentally, nineteenth-century Liberalism meant democracy. Its ultimate aim was to break down the bars which excluded from political life the classes of people whose intellectual, social and economic significance was becoming unmistakably predominant. For its immediate aim, it demanded liberty and equality. The content of these much-abused terms was explained in accordance with the philosophy of the eighteenth century—that is, by the dogmas which had been demonstrated by Montesquieu and Rousseau and formulated in the Declaration of the Rights of Man. "Liberty" was held to consist in a series of rights defined by Nature itself, and "equality," in the possession of all these rights by every man by the fact of his humanity. Within the sacred circle of these rights no governmental power could intrude. Against every claim of authority to do so, as derived from God or custom or tradition, was opposed the decree of supreme and beneficent Nature. The precise character of Nature—this kindly source of human rights—was no less variously and indeterminately defined by nineteenth-century than it had been by eighteenth-century philosophers; and the list of rights that were deduced, by laborious speculation, from Nature in the abstract bore a suspiciously close resemblance to one which could be compiled from the very concrete constitutional law and practice of England and the United States. Yet Nature, and Nature interpreted by reason, continued throughout the period we are discussing to be the ultimate basis of the Liberal creed.

It was, however, in regard to *civil* rather than *political* rights that the code of Nature was considered conclusive by all shades of Liberals. As to political rights, especially that of the suffrage, Liberalism was much divided. The more extreme spirits

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in its ranks were quite sure that Nature and reason immutably prescribed participation in all the functions of government as the right of every man. Less radical elements found in Nature the right of representation, but not of participation, in political functions; and many were loath to admit that even participation in the designation of a representative was within Nature's gift to every man. Finally, those Liberals who shaded imperceptibly into the ranks of Conservatism itself, maintained that, while Nature enjoined indisputably the guarantee of civil rights to every man, the assignment and enjoyment of political authority were matters of human expediency, varying with times, places and circumstances, and not determinable *a priori*. Liberty to all, authority to the qualified, was the maxim of this school.

The Conservative opposition to the views and purposes of the various groups of Liberalism was embodied for the most part in the royal and aristocratic classes of the old régime. Its practical spirit was expressed in that curious intermonarchic agreement known as the Holy Alliance, in the forcible interference to suppress constitutional government in Italy, Spain and elsewhere, in the rigorous espionage and censorship over thought and expression throughout Europe, in the bitter resistance of the aristocracy in England to the diminution of their ancient prerogatives by Parliamentary reform, and in the extreme assertions of aristocratic and monarchic privilege which led to the explosions of 1830 and 1848. Philosophically, Conservatism expressed itself in three theories: first, that of the divine right of the old monarchic and aristocratic order—that political authority emanated from God and could not be questioned by any merely human agency; second, the theory that, if Nature were to be consulted at all as to the basis of political organization, her answer would be that inequality and not equality was the universal principle among men, and that, therefore, aristocracy and not democracy was the order of Nature; third, the theory that the appropriate social, legal and political institutions for any people were to be discovered, not through any assumption as to the nature of man in general, but by a consideration of the character of the particular people as revealed in its history, and that the institutions which had come to prevail at any particular time through peaceful development must be presumed to have more inherent justice and validity than any others that might be suggested.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of these three views, the third characterized the most moderate of the Conservatives, and largely determined the actual solution of the problems of the time. It afforded a ground on which the least extreme of both Liberals and Conservatives were able, from time to time, to stand together. It triumphed in the Whig reforms in England and in the July monarchy in France; and it profoundly influenced, if it did not fully control, the application of that principle which expresses most fully the contribution of this period of the nineteenth century to political science,—the principle of Constitutionalism in both state and government.

Let us consider for a moment the source and nature of this principle. To Liberals of every shade in this period the indispensable token and guarantee of the liberty which they sought was a body of law, which should to some extent control and determine the power and procedure of the persons who exercised political authority. With few exceptions the Liberals demanded that this body of law be expressed in a written document. "Constitution" came to mean specifically "written constitution," and the triumph of Liberalism is significantly shown by the fact that, at the middle of the century, a great majority of states in the civilized world were equipped with instruments of this kind.

To Conservatism, however, the written constitution was an object of abhorrence. In practice, two features were generally insisted upon as indispensable to such a document: first, a distinct enumeration of the rights of the individual, with which government was under no circumstances to interfere; second, a description of the organs of government, and a body of rules determining their actual operation. The individual rights normally secured were those that had come to be known as natural rights, and the organs of government with which the practice of written constitutions was associated included some form of popular representative assembly. But both natural rights and popular representation were of course diametrically opposed to the ideas of the old régime; and, furthermore, the most fundamental conception of the nature of state and government that underlay the theory of a written constitution was unacceptable to Conservatives of every shade. For to the Liberals the constitution was the expression of the people's will, and had no more of permanence or immutability than that will.

Upon this view of political fundamentals, Conservatives of ev-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ery shade made aggressive war. The high priests of autocracy saw only horrid sacrilege in any meddling by the common people with the divine mystery of the state. To suppose that any written phrases, open to the interpretation of the vulgar, could express the essentials of political life, was to the obscurantists and mystics supreme foolishness. No constitution, declared Joseph de Maistre, the most brilliant exponent of this view, results from deliberation. In every constitution there is something that cannot be written, that must be left in venerable obscurity under penalty of destroying the state. The more there is that is written, the feebler is the political structure. When a nation begins to reflect upon itself, its laws and its life are already determined.

Something of the spirit of these phrases of de Maistre appeared also in the thought of the scientific and the historical schools of Conservatism. To the theory that the state is made, they opposed Topsy's idea that it merely grows. Burke's glowing denunciations of the French Revolution give the key-note of their cry. Men are in the state and subject to government, not through their own deliberate choice, but through an inexorable decree of their nature. The constitution of a given political society is never to be found in any document, however carefully framed and however solemnly proclaimed as the fundamental law. The bond which truly unites and determines a people in their social and political life consists in the aggregate of the numberless conventions and understandings through which, in the course of ages, the varying relations and institutions of the community have been developed and adapted to its greatest convenience. In other words,—and in the phrase which became the distinguishing mark of a prevailing school of political philosophy—the state is not a mechanism, but an organism. There is, indeed, a mystery in the state, but it is the mystery of all life and growth; and the remedy for intolerable ills in the state, as in the individual, is not the charlatan's panacea of death and resurrection, but the wise physician's study of the history and character of the particular condition, followed by the removal of defects in this organ and in that, without any pretence of touching the life principle itself.

This general view was that on which the practical constitutionalism of the first period of the century was worked out. It was the doctrine which the reforming Whigs in England applied,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as against the demand of Bentham and the Radicals for a remodelling of institutions in accordance with their *a priori* scheme. It was the doctrine which inspired the famous protest of Savigny against codifying, and thus assuming to stereotype, German private law. It was the doctrine, finally, which is clearly revealed by an examination of the content and working of the constitutions that resulted from the agitations of the period we are discussing. These constitutions were, indeed, written constitutions; but how different in character from the type which had been conceived in the enthusiasm of the early Revolution! In many cases, the actual document announced itself to be, not the deliberate expression of a people's will, signifying their choice of government, but the grant of certain institutions by a monarch to his subjects. Liberties were, indeed, guaranteed to the man and the citizen, but rarely the sweeping immunities that had figured in the Declaration of the Rights of Man. A representative legislature was in every case provided for, but rarely so organized as to interfere with the ancient domination of the aristocratic classes, or endowed with such power as to insure the development of more popular institutions. And, above all, there very early appeared the vexed question of the right of interpretation—the question which, in the long run, showed to every one that a written constitution was, not a remedy for all the ills that political life is heir to, but merely a palliative for some particular evil conditions at some particular times. It was under color of an interpretation of a written constitution that Charles X. of France issued his July Ordinances and precipitated the Revolution of 1830; it was by an interpretation of the Prussian Constitution that Bismarck carried through his policy of the conflict-time—an interpretation, moreover, which he, with characteristic cynicism, readily abandoned when it ceased to serve his purpose; and it was through interpretation that the constitution of the United States—the written constitution *par excellence,* the most wonderful instrument, according to Mr. Gladstone, ever struck off at a given moment by the thought and purpose of man—was made the basis for the efforts of two great masses of fellow citizens to annihilate each other.

The written constitution had, indeed, done its work by the time it had become generally prevalent. In its true character, it was found to be, not an indispensable feature of every sound

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

political system, but merely an ingenious expedient for facilitating the transition from one system to another. Through it the political ideals and characteristic principles of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries have been crystallized and put into form for permanent exhibition. Political antiquarians are thus enabled to study the past at their ease; lawyers can wrangle and construe and assert—sometimes with real belief at the basis of their assertion—that in the articles and sections and phrases and words of the document is to be seen the essence of the state; but, behind and all around the scanty code, the real life of the body politic goes serenely on regardless of all the puny efforts to cramp and fetter it.

In the development of nineteenth-century constitutionalism, the chief types—the unwritten and the written or, as Mr. Bryce names them, the flexible and the rigid—have been furnished by Great Britain and the United States respectively. In the long run, the British type has proved the more permanent; for the limitations on government and on sovereignty itself which were originally the characteristic mark of American constitutionalism have in large measure disappeared, and on the impressive, but unstable, foundation of necessity and destiny has arisen for the contemplation of mankind that structure which to the forefathers would have seemed such a monstrosity—the unwritten constitution of the United States.

II.

The second period of the nineteenth century, embracing the decades from the sixth to the ninth inclusive, has for the controlling topics of its politics, both theoretical and practical, Nationalism and Socialism. This is the period of Bismarck and Lincoln, of Karl Marx and, equally significant in the opposite sense, of Herbert Spencer. The constitutional liberty of the individual, the goal of the strenuous struggle of the previous decades, was now subordinated to the demand for national unity in governmental organization and majority rule in economic organization.

The idea of nationality, as the normal and natural criterion of political organization and independence, was by no means new to this period, but it now gained overwhelming importance from the practical work of Bismarck and Cavour in Europe, and from the terrific struggle through which the principle was maintained

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the United States. The working out of the idea was attended by a change of relative position among the European Powers. France was supplanted by Germany as the central figure. France, with a homogeneous population and a compact territory under a unified government, had only that interest in the principle of nationality which was incidental to the ambition of the third Napoleon. England, with Ireland on her hands, was necessarily cold toward the doctrine of nationality *per se*. Her philosophy easily conceded that the Poles were not Russians because they said they were not, and that the South-Carolinians were entitled to independence of the United States because they believed they were; but it could not admit that Irishmen were not Englishmen or were entitled to independent government for any such reasons. The German, the Italian and the American peoples, however, were able to make the principle of nationality predominant in both theory and practice.

The triumph of Nationalism in the seventh decade of the nineteenth century was promptly followed by a transformation in the principle—a transformation that has determined in large measure the later stages of political development throughout the world. In the first period of the century, Nationalism had been the sister creed of Liberalism. National independence and constitutional government had commonly been united as summing up what was just and natural in the aspirations of a people. In the name of both principles together the Poles had fought for independence of Russia, the Belgians had achieved their independence of the Dutch king, and the Italians had resisted the Austrian influence south of the Alps. Nationalism had been essentially defensive in character and application; its goal had been the release of peoples from alien governmental control. But the events of the sixties revealed a new and widely different aspect of the doctrine. Nationalism passed from defence to aggression. Its chief end came to be, not the release of a people from foreign rule, but the subjection of every people to its appropriate domestic rule. In the name of the nation, politicians, theoretical and practical, demanded a reordering of the world. God and nature and human reason and history were all triumphantly shown to have decreed that, in the homogeneous population inhabiting a continuous territory, should be the final and unquestionable unit of political organization. "National

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unity" superseded the time-honored "consent of the governed" as the justifying principle of sovereign dominion. Love of liberty and of self-government, once the noblest theme of poetry and philosophy, now became mere graceless "particularism." In the name of the nation, Hanoverians, Saxons and Hessians were incorporated in the Prussian state; in the name of the nation, eleven million Southerners were harried into subjection to the Government at Washington. Political Science mapped out the whole world into geographic unities, in each of which it was solemnly declared to be the end of all human destiny that some ethnic unit should be neatly and eternally ensconced.

There were difficulties in the practical application of this, as of every other ultimate principle. Ethnic homogeneity was in last analysis rather hard to define. Some clear objective test was needed to determine where one nation ended and another began. Identity of blood, of language, of religion, of traditions, of history, were all duly tried, and all alike found wanting. Nor was the bounding of geographic unity any easier in practice. Alsace, we know, was, and doubtless still is, German because it is east of the Vosges, but equally French because it is west of the Rhine. The Alps were undoubtedly ordained by God and nature to be the divider of nations; but it is hazardous to assert the same of the scarcely less formidable Rockies. Yet, with all these difficulties perfectly apprehended, the idea still persists that there is something peculiarly natural and permanent and rational in the so-called "national state." Switzerland and Russia and Austria-Hungary are all looked upon as rather out of the orbit of the student of politics, because they do not conform to the canons of ethnic and geographic unity.

Without examining farther the characteristics of this peculiarly nineteenth-century idea of nationality, let us look a moment at the influence which the idea has had upon the development of the conception of liberty. *Pari passu* with the realization of democratic ideals in governmental organization, there had developed the antithesis of the two systems of thought familiar to us as "Socialism" and "Individualism." But vaguely and obscurely manifested during the first half of the century, the conflict between the two became well defined and furious with the triumph of constitutionalism in 1848-9. Both the opposing systems derived their lineage from the earlier Liberalism. The So-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cialist claimed that, with the people in control of the governmental organization, there could be no limit set to the power which they could justly exercise; restrictions that had been insisted upon before, when political authority was in the hands of the one or the few, had no justification, he declared, when authority was in the hands of all. The Individualist, on the other hand, steadfastly maintained that the rights of man had not ceased to exist with the triumph of democracy. The end of government, whether controlled by classes or by masses, was to protect these rights, not to override them. The state, indeed, had no other cause for its existence than to assist the individual in developing the powers that are in him, and any application of the public resources to other ends was despotism.

This modern doctrine of Individualism, having its source in the idealism of the German Fichte and Humboldt at the beginning of the nineteenth century, received a very perfect development through the works of the English Mill and Spencer in the fifties and sixties. England at this date had just abandoned her ancient system of agricultural protection; and her philosophers, followed by many in other lands, were enthusiastically in favor of extending over the whole field of commerce and industry the *laissez-faire* which had been applied to English agriculture. Paternalism, which, after all, lies always close behind the fraternalism, of the Socialist, was without doubt distinctly overpowered by that ardor for individualistic liberty which was so widespread in the two decades following the middle of the century. If since then Socialism and Paternalism have gained the upper hand, and government is now conceived rather as an agency for the positive promotion of the interests of those classes who control it, the result may be traced to that passion for Nationalism which supplanted the passion for constitutionalism. With the cry that industrial independence was essential to the complete national life, the United States and Germany took the lead in reversing the tendency which England's free-trade policy had created, and gradually all the leading nations of the earth fell into line with them. In the presence of universal tariff barriers, in which the powers of government are most extensively and ingeniously employed for the primary advantage of specific classes, it is hard to find an adequate ground on which to resist the demand of any other class for a similar employment of gov-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernmental power in behalf of its interests. Nationalism has sounded the knell of Individualism—whether forever or not, it remains for the future to disclose.

Another conspicuous feature of nineteenth-century politics that experienced serious if not irreparable disaster through the Nationalistic movement was the doctrine of federalism. As the principle upon which the United States developed its astonishing progress in the first half-century, federalism came to be regarded as the touchstone of pure gold in governmental organization. The most logical constitution-makers in the world, the publicists of Latin America, brought forth a large crop of systems embodying this vital principle. Witness the United States of Mexico, the United States of Colombia, the United States of Venezuela, the United States of Brazil, and so on. Though federalism was, in its first application, merely a more or less mechanical device for combining previously well-defined and independent political units into a single system, there came later to be found in it the invaluable principle of local self-government. The partition of power between central and state organizations was treated, not merely as an essential to the union of distinct sovereignties, but as a guarantee of individual liberty against all sovereignty. But the sweep of nationalizing sentiment obliterated this beneficent conception. In realizing the ends and aspirations of the nation, the autonomy of states received as little consideration as the rights of individuals. Centralization of power, in the name and for the purposes of national unity, accompanied the progress of every body politic in which federalism had for any reason obtained a hold.

III.

After this very general survey of the tendencies manifested in the nationalistic stage of the century's progress, we are able to understand very readily the influences which have produced the later and final stage. This, covering the last fifteen or twenty years, may with a fair degree of accuracy be designated the era of the new imperialism. The events that have given character to this period are so recent and familiar as not to need detailed recital. The broad principle that has underlain them is that the nation, perfected through the suppression of Individualism and of federalism, must break the bonds of ethnic and geographic homogeneity and project its beneficent influence into the world at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

large. Such, at all events, is the philosophic theory of the movement. The practical aspects of the operation have, of course, been of a rather less exalted nature. The impulse has come from the demand for markets on the part of the highly stimulated industries of Germany and the United States. It was in the eighties that the Germans instituted that picturesque world-wide hunt for colonial lands that gave such a shock to Great Britain and such amusement to the rest of mankind. It was in 1890 that Africa was parcelled out, with a brave paraphernalia of "spheres of influence" and "Hinterlands" for the parcellers, but with no sign of respect for ethnic and geographic unity among the parcelled. Three years later, the unmistakable ambition of the American people to manifest their power beyond their national boundaries was thwarted, though with great difficulty, by President Cleveland; but in 1895 he also gave way, and by his Venezuelan message unchained the passions and aspirations which found a temporary satisfaction in the incidents and results of the war with Spain. The United States, the most perfect type of advanced democracy and Nationalism, entered fully upon the task of governing distant and hopelessly alien peoples by the methods of autocracy. In the movement for the final partition of Asia into spheres of influence for the European powers—a movement to which the indomitable will and energy of one brave little Asiatic people has raised up an obstacle which at present seems likely to be insuperable—the great American Republic has taken a recognized place, as a regulating, if not a promoting, factor. There no longer remains one first-class nation whose conscious aim is internal perfection rather than external dominion—not one that does not see in dependencies the indispensable proof of political competence. Constitutionalism and Nationalism have been superseded as controlling dogmas in the world's politics.

What, now, is the meaning of this new imperialism? Is there in it anything really new? Is it any different from the imperialism of Athens in the days of Pericles or the imperialism of Rome when Julius Cæsar took the helm? Has it for its foundation anything different from the principle proclaimed by Machiavelli that no state, whether monarchic or popular, can live a peaceful and quiet life, but each must either conquer or be conquered? Or anything other than the doctrine of the doughty Thomas Hobbes, transferred from the individual to the nation,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that life consists in an unceasing struggle for power after power, that ends only with the grave? Or anything different from the principle to which the theories of evolution lend support, that a nation, like any other organism, must either grow or die?

To very many thoughtful supporters of the new imperialism a way of escape from the implications of these questions appears in the conception that the modern movement is essentially altruistic—that it is founded upon duty to others rather than satisfaction of our own desires. This is not a new idea in the history of politics. Athens pointed to the beneficent effects of her supremacy upon the subject states. The philosophical clients of the plundering Roman proconsuls could always declaim with great effect upon the rescue of suffering peoples from misrule and upon the uplifting influence of the *pax Romana*. Likewise the supporters of our modern imperialism find comfort in the good that has been done. The British in India, it is said, have abolished suttee; the French in Africa have made Timbuctoo accessible to the methods of modern commerce and to the allurements of Parisian art; the Germans have made the forms of their bureaucracy familiar in darkest Kiao-Chao; and the United States has at least instilled into the minds of the Igorrotes the moral significance of trousers in the White House.

Whether or not the bestowal of these and other even more important blessings of Aryan civilization upon races that yearn passionately to be uncivilized is the true and an adequate justification of the modern imperialism, it is not the province of this paper to determine. Its function is fulfilled in setting forth the mere succession of ideals and leading principles that has characterized the past century. The constitutionalism of the first period took a form which was in some measure novel in the history of politics; the nationalism of the second period presented also certain features that had no precedent; but the imperialism that closed the century's record can hardly be said to have manifested thus far any characteristics that distinguish it from the movements in which throughout all history the powerful governments of the earth have extended their sway over the weak and incapable.

WILLIAM A. DUNNING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ENGLISH FEELING TOWARDS AMERICANS.

BY W. D. HOWELLS.

THE perilous question whether the English like the Americans better than formerly is one which I hope to leave where I found it. An Englishman might counter by asking whether the Americans like the English better than formerly; but that would not be answering the question. Yet Americans have heard and read so much of their increasing national acceptance with their contemporary ancestors that they may be excused, if not satisfied, in a curiosity as to the fact. Is the universal favor which an emotional and imaginative press like ours has portrayed them as presently enjoying in England a reality; or is it one of the dreams which our press now and then indulges, and of which the best that can be said is that they do no harm?

I.

One not only hears of this favor at home, but, when one goes to England, one still hears of it. To be sure one hears of it mainly from Americans, but Americans have the best means of knowing the fact; they are chiefly concerned, and they are supported in their belief by the almost unvaried amenity of the English journals, which only very rarely take the tone towards Americans formerly habitual with them. Their change of tone is the most obvious change which I think Americans can count upon noting when they come to England; and I am far from reckoning it insignificant. It did not happen of the newspapers themselves; it must be the expression of a prevalent mood, if not a very deeply rooted feeling, in their readers. One hears of their interest, their kindness, not from the Americans alone; the English themselves sometimes profess it; and, if they overestimate it, their generous error is in the right direction. At the end it must cease to be an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

error, for, as we Americans all know, we need only to be better understood in order to be more highly prized. Besides, liking is much oftener the effect of willing than has been supposed.

But if the case were quite the contrary, if it were obvious to the casual experience of the American traveller or sojourner in England that his nationality is now liked less rather than more there, I should still be sorry to disturb what is at the worst no worse than a fond illusion. But the case is by no means the contrary; and yet, in consenting to some reason in the iridescence which the situation in the American fancy wears, I should wish to distinguish. For a beginning, I should not wish to go farther than to say, that the sort of Englishmen who have always liked Americans, because they liked the American ideal and the kind of character realized from it, now probably like them better than ever. They are, indeed, less critical of our departure from our old ideal than some Americans, perhaps because they have not foreseen, as such Americans have foreseen, the necessary effect in American character. They can still allow themselves the pleasure which comes from being confirmed in an impression by events, and in that pleasure they may somewhat romance us; but even such Englishmen are not blindly fond of us. The other sort of Englishmen, the sort that never liked our ideal or our character, probably now like us as little as ever, except as they have noted our change of ideal, and expect a change of character. To them, we may very well have seemed a sort of civic dissenters, with the implication of some such quality of offence as the notion of dissent suggests to minds like theirs.

But it is safe to conjecture that this sort of Englishman is too old, or too old-fashioned, to live much longer; he suffers with the decay of certain English interests which the American prosperity imperilled before it began to imperil English ideals, if it has indeed done so. His dying out counts for an increase of favor for us; we enjoy through it a sort of promotion by seniority.

But a new kind of Englishman has come up of late years; and, so far as he is friendly to us, his friendliness should be more gratifying than that even of our older friends. He has been in America, either much or little, and has come to like us because he has seen us at home. If such an Englishman is rich and noble, he has seen our plutocracy, and has liked it because it is lively and inventive in its amusements, and profusely original in its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

splendors; but he need not be poor and plebeian to have seen something of our better life, and divined something of our real meaning from it. He will not be to blame if he has not divined our whole meaning; for we are at present rather in the dark as to that ourselves; and, certainly, no American who met him in England could wish to blame him at all, for his cordiality forms the warmest welcome that the American can have there. If he has been in America and not liked us, or our order or ideal, he has still the English good-nature; and if you do not insist upon being taken nationally, there are many chances that he will take you personally, and, if he finds you not at all like an American, he will like you, as he liked others in America whom he found not at all like Americans.

II.

It is the foible, however, of many Americans, both at home and abroad, that they want to be taken nationally, and not personally, by foreigners. Beyond any other people, we wish to be loved by other peoples, even by others whom we do not love, and we wish to be loved in the lump. We would like to believe that somehow our sheer Americanism rouses the honor and evokes the veneration of the alien; and, as we have long had a grudge against the English, we would be particularly glad to forget it in a sense of English respect and affection. We would fain believe that the English have essentially changed towards us; but we might easily deceive ourselves, as we could realize if we asked ourselves the reasons for such a change.

The English are very polite, far politer than they have been represented to be; and they will not wittingly wound the American visitor, unless for just cause, like business, or the truth. Still, I should say that the American will fare best with them if he allows himself to be taken individually, rather than typically. One's nationality is to others, after a first moment of surprise, a bore and a nuisance, which cannot be got out of the way too soon. I cannot keep my interest in a German or an Italian because he is such; and why should not it be the same with an Englishman in regard to Americans? If he thinks about our nationality at all, in its historical character, it is rather a pill, which he may be supposed to take unwillingly, whether he believes we were historically right or not. He may say just things about it, but he will say them more for the profit of Englishmen than for the pleasure

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Americans. With our pleasure, nationally, an Englishman is very little concerned, and either he thinks it out of taste to show any curiosity concerning us, in the bulk, or else he feels none. He has lately read and heard a good deal of talk about us; but I doubt if it has indelibly impressed him. If we have lately done things which in their way could not be ignored, they could certainly be forgotten, and many Englishmen, in spite of them, still remain immensely incurious about us. The American who wishes to be taken nationally by them must often inspire them with a curiosity about us before he can gratify it.

III.

The English have, or they often express, an amiable notion of us as enormously rich, and perhaps they think we are vain of our millionaires, and would be flattered by an implication of wealth as common to us all as our varying accent. But it is as hard for some of us to live up to a full pocket as for others to live up to a full brain. It is hard even to meet the expectation that you will know, or know about, our tremendously moneyed people, whose fantastic gorgeousness looms up across the Atlantic, from the cliffs of Newport or the millionaire blocks along Fifth Avenue. Here, indeed, is a curiosity which you do not have to inspire before you gratify it, for it exists already; while, as to our political affairs, or even our military or naval affairs, not to speak of our scientific or literary affairs, the curiosity that you gratify you must first have inspired. The glories of our triumphs over Spain, and our dazzling victories in the Philippines are already tarnished, but the splendid follies of our rich society are always fresh. Travelled Englishmen have come home and told of them; and is it all true?

Their curiosity on the point does not judge them, as might be supposed. The English are very romantic, with a young, lusty appetite for the bizarre and the marvellous, as their taste in fiction evinces; and they need not be contemned as sordid admirers of money because they wish to know the lengths it can go to with the people who seem to be just now making the most money. Their interest in a phenomenon which we ourselves have not every reason to be proud of, is not without justification, as we must allow if we consider a little; for, if we consider, we must own that our greatest achievement in the last twenty or thirty years has been in the heaping up of riches. Our magnificent success in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that sort really eclipses our successes in every other, and the average American who comes abroad must be content to shine in the reflected glory of those Americans who have recently, more than any others, rendered our name illustrious. If we do not like the fact, all that we have to do is to set about doing commensurate things in art, in science, in letters, or even in arms. For the present, we have not done them, or at least we are not doing them. The five-hundred-thousand-selling novel itself is a proof of our pecuniary, rather than our literary, prowess.

It will not quite do to say that the non-millionaire American enjoys in England the interest mixed with commiseration which is the lot of a poor relation of the great among kindly people. That would not be true; and, possibly, in the last analysis, the fact is merely that the name "American" first awakens in the English some such associations with riches as the name "South African" awakened before it awakened others more poignant and more personal. Already the South African had begun to rival the American in the popular imagination; as the Boer War fades more and more into the past, the time may come when we shall be confusedly welcomed as "Africans" or "South Americans."

IV.

If I were to offer what I have been saying as my opinions, or my conclusions from sufficient observations, I should be unfair, if not uncandid. The sum of what one sees and hears in a foreign country is as nothing to the sum of what one does not see and hear; and the immense balance may be so far against the foregoing inferences that it is the part of mere prudence to declare that they are not my opinions or conclusions, but are only impressions, vague and hurried, guesses from the cursory observations, deductions from slight casual incidents. They are mere gleams from social facets, sparks struck out by chance encounter, and never glancing lights from the rarefied atmosphere in which the two nations have their formal reciprocities. For all that I have really the right to say, from substantial evidence to the contrary, I might very well say that the English value us for those things of the mind and soul which we are somewhat neglectful of ourselves; and it is only their love of fairy tales which is taken with the notion of an opulence so widespread among us as to constitute us a nation of actual and potential millionaires.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They would hasten to reproach me, I am afraid, for speaking of England, though merely for purposes of illustration, as "a foreign country." One is promptly told that Americans are not regarded as foreigners in England, and is left to conjecture one's self a sort of middle species between English and alien, a little less kin than Canadian and more kind than Australian, though not equally within the scope of a preferential tariff. The idea has its quaintness; but the American in England has been singularly unfortunate if he has had reason to believe that the kindness done him is not felt. What has always been true of the English is true now. They do not say or do the thing which is not, out of politeness; their hypocrisies, if they have any, are for their God, and not for their fellow man. When they talk of their American brethren, they mean it; just as when they do not talk of them so, they mean something less, or nothing at all. The American who wishes to be taken nationally, may cordially trust any expression friendly to our nation that he hears; but, still, I think he will have a better time if he prefers being taken personally. That is really making one's self at home in a different, I will no longer say a "foreign," country; the English are eager hosts, and wish you to make yourself at home if they like you. Nationally, we cannot make ourselves, or be made, at home, except in the United States. To any other people, to people even sometimes claiming to be nearer than the first degree of cousinship, our nationality, taking it in bulk, is necessarily a mystery. We are so very like them; why should we be so very unlike them? The difference puzzles them, annoys them; why seek points of it, and turn them to the light? The same mystery distresses the Americans when the points of their own difference are turned to the light. A man's nationality is something he is justly proud of, but not till it is put aside can the man of another nation have joy of him humanly, spiritually.

If you insist upon talking to the English about American things, you have them in an unknown world, a really unknowable world, as you yourself know it; and you bewilder and weary them; unless they are studying Americanism, and then they still do not quite understand you. I say again that I do not know why any one should wish to be caressed for his nationality. I think one might more self-respectfully wish to be liked for one's self than joined with a hundred million compatriots, and loved in the lump. If the English, however, are now trying to love us nationally, we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should be careful not to tax their affections too heavily, or demand too much of them. We must remember that they are more apt to be deceived by our likeness to themselves than by our unlikeness. When an Englishman and an American meet on common ground, they have arrived from opposite poles. The Englishman, though he knows the road the American has come, cannot really imagine it. His whole experience of life has taught him that, if you have come that road, you are not the kind of man you seem; therefore, you have not come that road, or else you are another kind of man. He revolves in a maze of hopeless conjecture; he gives up trying to guess your conundrum, and reads into you the character of some Englishman of parallel tradition. If he likes you after that, you may be sure it is for yourself, and not for your nation. All the same, he may not know it, and may think he likes you because you are an agreeable American.

V.

My line of reasoning, or I had better say of fancying, (that, on such dangerous ground, is safest,) is forcing an inference from which I shrink a little. But the candor which I would be so glad not to practise obliges me to say, that I think the American who is himself interesting would have been as welcome in England twenty-five years ago as at this day, and he would not have been expected to be rich, or to have the acquaintance of rich Americans. Already, at that remote period, certain fellow countrymen of ours had satisfied the English taste for wildness in us. There had been Buffalo Bill, with his show, and there had been other Buffalo Bills, literary ones, who were themselves shows. There had arisen a conjecture, a tardy surmise, of an American fineness then, which might be as well in its way as the American wildness; and the American who had any imaginable touch of this found as warm a liking ready for him then as the wild American found earlier, or the rich American finds later.

In fact, interesting Americans have always been personally liked in England, if I must really go to the extreme of saying it. What the English now all join in owning, if the question of greater kindness between the two countries comes up, is that their ruling class made a vast mistake in choosing, officiously, though not officially, the side of the South in our Civil War. They own it frankly, eagerly. But they owned the same thing frankly, if not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so eagerly, twenty-five years ago. Even during the Civil War, I doubt if an acceptable American would have suffered personally among them. He would have suffered nationally, but he has now and then to suffer so still, for they cannot have the same measure of his nationality as he, and they necessarily tread upon its subtile circumferences here and there.

From the very beginning of Americanism the case has been the same. The American in England during the Civil War was strangely unfortunate if he did not meet many and great Englishmen who thought and felt with him; and, if there were now any American so stricken in years as to be able to testify, from his own experience, of the English attitude towards us in the War of Independence, he could tell us of the outspoken and constant sympathy of Chatham, Burke, Fox, Walpole, and their like, with the American cause, which they counted the English cause. He could tell of the deep undercurrent of favor among the English people, which the superficial course of power belied, and at last ceased to control, in our earlier vital war, as well as in our later.

So much for that consideration of us nationally which I do not think England, in her quality of hostess, is bound to show her several American guests. I do not blame her that the sympathy of her greatest sons, so far as it has been shown us nationally, has been shown in her interest, which they believed the supreme interest of mankind, rather than in our interest, which it is for us to believe the supreme interest of mankind. Even when they are talking America, they are thinking England; they cannot otherwise; they must; it is imperative; it is essential that they should.

We talk of England on the same terms, with our own inner version. Once an eminent Englishman spoke, across the table to an American, of our Revolution as the "Rebellion." The American in return quietly said "Revolution," and the Englishman took instant note of the difference and did not fail afterwards to say "Revolution." I think the American was wise to consider that the word "Revolution," to that Englishman, could and did mean only the Revolution of 1688, when James II. was driven from power, and a new succession to the throne established.

VI.

There is another point in this inquiry which I hesitate to touch, and which, if I were better advised, I should not touch; that is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the English interest in the beauty and brilliancy of our women. Their charm is now magnanimously conceded and now violently confuted in the public prints; now and then an Englishman lets himself go—over his own signature, even, at times—and denounces our women, their loveliness, their liveliness, their goodness, in terms which, if I repeated them, would make some timider spirits pause in their resolution to marry English dukes and run English society. But his hot words are hardly cold, before another Englishman comes to the rescue of our countrywomen, and lifts them again to that pinnacle where their merits, quite as much as the imagination of their novelists, have placed them. Almost quite as much as our millionaires, they are the object of a curiosity which one has not had to inspire. Where, in what part, in which favored city, do they most abound? What is the secret of their dazzling wit and beauty, the heart of their mystery? The most ardent of their votaries must flush in generous deprecation when these orphic inquiries flow from lips quite as divine as their own.

For the rest, if there is really that present liking for Americans in England, which we must wish to touch with all delicacy as the precious bloom of a century-plant at last coming to flower, the explanation may be sought perhaps in an effect of the English nature to which I shall not be the one to limit it. They have not substantially, so much as phenomenally, changed towards us. They are, like ourselves, always taking stock, examining themselves to see what they have on hand. From time to time, they will, say, accuse themselves of being insular; and then, suddenly, they invite themselves to be Continental, to be French, to be German, to be Italian, to be Bulgarian, or whatever; and, for a while, they believe that they have become so. All this time they remain immutably English. It is not that they are insensible of their defects; they tell themselves of them in clamorous tones; and, of late, possibly, they have asked themselves why they are not what they think the Americans are in certain things. If the logic of their emotions in this direction were a resolution to like all the Americans with a universal affection, I should admire their spirit; but I should feel a difficulty in its operation for a reason which I hesitate to confess: I do not like *all* the Americans myself.

W. D. Howells.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WHITE PERIL: THE IMMEDIATE DANGER OF THE NEGRO.

BY WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN.

On a recent tour of the Southern States, from Virginia to Texas, I took with me two pictures of Southern civilization at earlier periods. One was Frederick Law Olmsted's record of his travels in the South near the close of the slavery régime—a series of volumes which John Morley and the late E. L. Godkin have both thought worthy of comparison with Arthur Young's "Travels in France." The other was my own abundant memories of Southern life in the period immediately after Reconstruction.

Comparing my present-day observations with these two presentments of the past, I was convinced that a very important and a very deep change, a change in the basis of the entire industrial system of the South, is quietly in progress. For confirmation, I have turned to the elaborate and painstaking Report on the Negroes which has recently issued from the Bureau of the Census at Washington. Confirmations of a sort I do seem to find there; but it is extremely doubtful if from that source alone I should ever have derived my conviction. In presenting it, therefore, I shall rely rather on the concrete observations of my journey than on the figures which may seem to sustain them. These would not have their full value nor their true significance unless one applied them ceaselessly to a mental picture of the South as it is, and to Southerners as they are, and to negroes and mulattoes as they are—not to dehumanized "whites" and "blacks."

It is a century, perhaps, since Virginia ceased to be the main source of the controlling tendencies of Southern life. Her soil is no longer the best ground for the study of the civilization which had its rise there. Geography, however, abets the suggestion of history that any examination of the South should begin there:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and, if one is looking particularly for signs of economic and industrial change, Virginia is by no means to be neglected. It is doubtful if in any but the very youngest of the States deeper social changes could be observed than in this, the oldest.

Two movements of population are, perhaps, the most important: an exodus and an immigration. There is a steady and widespread movement of negroes from the countrysides into the towns, and out of the State into the North; and there is a moderate but fairly steady, and apparently increasing, inflow of whites. The gain of whites from without is not, it is true, so rapid as in many other parts of the country. The rate is probably below the average for the Atlantic tier of States. Neither is it equal to Virginia's present capacity and demand for white population: for there is much waste land within her borders that would yield a fair return to careful husbandry, there are many still untrodden avenues to wealth. But it is certainly interesting to learn that farmers from the far Northwest are coming nowadays in considerable numbers, sometimes in little colonies, to make their homes on the banks of the James and the Potomac and the Roanoke. What is still more significant is that some portion of our immense immigration from Europe is at last being diverted, be it only in driblets and wavelets, from the great Eastern cities and the growing States of the West and Northwest to the oldest of all the Southern States.

And it is not unreasonable to hope that immigration of both these kinds, which for a century and more the South has in vain desired, may continue to increase. The movement of the blacks townward and Northward is so widespread and persistent that it is only natural to wonder who will take their places on the farms. All over the State, complaints are heard of the scarcity of agricultural labor. Equally common is the complaint that the negro as a laborer, particularly as a farm-hand, is deteriorating. It is harder and harder, one hears on all sides, to bind him to the soil or to long terms of service in any line; and he is likely to leave at the very seasons when the farmer needs him the most. The situation,—taken with the fact of an increase of immigration, suggests the curious possibility of a sort of second colonization of the oldest of all our shores.

Even in the cities, though the proportion of negroes in the urban population has not declined, it is plain that more and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more white men are turning to kinds of work which used to be done by negroes only. In domestic service, it is true, this is not the case; and in justice it must be said that of all negro domestic servants the best are doubtless to be found in Eastern Virginia. The negroes of that region have profited by the longest training—and in the best school of manners—that any portion of the race has ever anywhere received. But it is plain that the whites are gaining in the shops and mills and factories, and in many other employments, in the Virginian towns. In the cities, working-men's suburbs, where the children one sees about the doors are white, are growing quite as fast as the quarters given over to negroes. This, it may as well be said at once, is true also of the cities in other parts of the South.

In the cities and towns of the Carolinas, where such a rapid progress has been made in the manufacture of cotton and of tobacco, these tendencies are even more strikingly exhibited. The new industrial movement in those States has been strongest in the interior counties, particularly in what is called the Piedmont section. The Piedmont country has always been the habitat of the small white farmer; and it is people of this class in whom and by whom the important changes have been wrought. It is chiefly they who have manned the new mills and factories, populated the new manufacturing towns, and increased so rapidly the population of the transformed older towns. To any one familiar with the old Southern class distinctions, this will be apparent from the briefest visit to such a place as Charlotte, in North Carolina, or Spartanburg, in South Carolina. The newcomers, it is easy to see, are "up-country folks"; and according to the nomenclature of his own particular quarter of the South the visitor will set them down as "Crackers," as "Moss-backs," as "Red-necks," as "Hillians," as "Coveites," as "Wool-hats," or as "Copperas-breeches."

True, there are negro quarters in all the larger towns of the Piedmont region, though not in the cotton-mill villages. It is true also that there are negroes employed in the tobacco factories. In these establishments, in fact, one finds them at work side by side with the whites, frequently on the same piece and at the same machine. That is a phenomenon which might have been observed in Richmond also. It is nowhere in the South quite so common a sight as to suggest the lying down together of the lion and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lamb. If, however, we consider it with a right historical perspective, the real sign of change is in the white man's being there, not in the presence of the negro.

In the cotton-mills, the negro is not to be found at all. A few years ago, one could have found him in a mill at Charleston, owned and managed by white men. Until a few months ago, he could also have been found in a little mill at Concord, in North Carolina, owned and managed by members of his race. But with the failure of these two experiments he seems to have disappeared entirely from the cotton industry of the South Atlantic and South Central States. The only cotton-mill in the entire South which now employs negroes is, I believe, at Dallas, Texas.* Meanwhile, to meet the demand for mill-hands in the Carolinas alone, from fifty to a hundred thousand white people have given up other employments,—mainly, no doubt, farming.

The failure of the negro to find a place in this industry, now firmly established in the South, and growing with an amazing growth, is too big a fact to be taken without some scrutiny of the tests by which his unfitness for it seems to have been established. At least two very high authorities are decidedly of opinion that the trials which have been made of negro labor in the cotton-mills are by no means conclusive. The president of half a dozen large and successful mills points out† that the experiment at Charleston was made under conditions which would probably have been fatal even if white labor had been employed. The industry never has taken root in the coast towns, nor, indeed, in any old urban community like Charleston. It is understood that the machinery of the Charleston mill was old; and a principal advantage of the Southern mills in general is that their machinery is of the newest and the best. The labor employed was not carefully selected, nor in any way segregated. The chances are that the capital behind the enterprise was inadequate. That was also the case in the experiment at Concord. In this view, Principal Washington, of Tuskeegee, concurs.‡ He believes that negro labor could be successfully used under the conditions which have been found essential with white labor: that is to say, in a segregated mill settlement, owned and controlled by the owners of the plant, and with adequate capital, competent management, and new machinery.

* A silk-mill at Fayetteville, N. C., operated by negroes, is said to be successful.

† In conversation with the writer. ‡ In a letter to the writer.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In this reasoning there is much force. But a lost battle is not restored by proving that it ought to have been won. It may not help the matter to explain that the field was unfavorable, the tactics bad, the odds unfair. Insufficient and inconclusive as the tests have been, the event may prove that the negro's chance in the cotton-mills is, none the less, lost forever. The mill president whose view has been given is not desirous of seeing the question reopened. The industry is in a good way as it is. The South is rapidly gaining on all the other centres of it. Every year, the white labor employed in the mills grows more and more skilful. It is also being trained systematically for the manufacture of finer and finer grades of cottons. Moreover, usage is fast hardening into custom, and custom soon makes rights. It is now quite probable that the Carolina mill-hands would instantly rebel at any such association with negroes as the operatives in tobacco factories accept as a matter of course. The superintendent of the largest mill in the Carolinas is positive that if a single negro operative were brought into it every man, woman, and child in the establishment would walk out. Even if no attempt were made to introduce negroes in the same mills with whites it is by no means certain that the whites would endure their competition.

The reader, no doubt, begins already to understand the nature of the change in the South's industrial system which my journey was by this time leading me to think that I perceived. What the Carolinas seem to exhibit better, perhaps, than any other part of the South is the rapid emergence of the native poor whites, the South's great unutilized industrial reserves, from the narrow limitations which slavery set them, and which nearly three hundred years of ignorance, inertia, and prejudice had strengthened into a Chinese wall of hopeless conservatism. They have come at once into competition with the negroes,—either direct, and on fairly equal terms, as in the tobacco factories, or indirect, and far more fatal to the negroes, as in the cotton-mills. What at present appears is that they no sooner entered into this great industry than the negroes were excluded from it altogether. The victory is signal. The effect of the exclusion on the negro's future can scarcely be overestimated. But this is only one of many advantages which in the townward movement, strong in both races, the poor white is winning in the search for town employments.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is certainly not unreasonable to associate these facts with the other movement among the negroes—the movement Northward.

Of that, however, less is heard as one travels farther Southward and Southwestward. Florida is evidently gaining negroes fast by migration, and the movement Southwestward, to the prairies and river-bottoms of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas, continues fairly steady. Nevertheless, in the cities and towns of the Lower South also, even in those of the Black Belt, it is apparent that the white people are changing their attitude toward the manual occupations. For one sign of the change, white barbers are now common, even in the smaller country towns. Twenty years ago, they were extremely rare outside of the real cities. A still more striking innovation is the occasional employment of white women, presumably from the up-country, as chambermaids in hotels—even, in one instance, in a hotel where the other servants are colored. It was left, however, for New Orleans, the largest of all distinctively Southern cities, to exhibit the general change more variously and convincingly than any other.

The population of New Orleans is peculiarly good material for the study of race relationships. The mixture, not of races merely, but of customs and standards, of traditions and ideals, is extraordinary. Yet it does not require a long observation of the present situation there to make one feel sure that the African has lost ground relatively to all the rest. It is possible now to live in New Orleans as free from any dependence on the services of negroes as one could be in New York or Boston. The supply of white domestic servants is, no doubt, still scant. But white cooks and waiters are not very hard to find; and white barbers and hair-dressers, white carpenters and joiners and masons and blacksmiths and shoe-makers, and the like, are at hand in sufficient numbers. Bricklaying is by a competent authority* declared to be the only trade which the negroes still control. The contrast in these occupations with the very recent past is fairly startling. In 1870, the city directory showed a total of 3,460 negroes at work as carpenters, cigar-makers, painters, clerks, shoe-makers, coopers, tailors, bakers, and blacksmiths and foundry hands. There are not to-day ten per cent. of that number of negroes employed in the same trades, several of which have been completely lost to the

* Mr. Norman Walker, of the "Times-Democrat," whose knowledge of New Orleans, past and present, is most thorough.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whites. Yet, meanwhile, the negro population of New Orleans has increased by more than fifty per cent.—a greater gain than the white population shows. The mass of the negroes are now enrolled in the occupations which require the least intelligence and skill, the class called merely "laborers" absorbing thousands.

It is actually held that in property and in social station, as well as in industry, the negroes of New Orleans are worse off today, relatively and absolutely, than they were in the year 1860. The statement may be misleading, however, unless one takes account of the unique place which the city held in Southern civilization while slavery persisted. It was the Mecca of free negroes. The Latin element in the white population was proportionally stronger than at present; and as a rule the Latins do not treat negroes as Anglo-Saxons do. Nowhere else in the South could a man with a single drop of African blood in his veins attain the degree of social acceptance which a considerable class of mulattoes enjoyed at New Orleans. A peculiar local custom went far to account for this, and for the material well-being, the intelligence, and the refinement of manners, which the New Orleans mulattoes frequently displayed. From an early period in the history of the town, a system of concubinage prevailed there, which was quite unlike the ordinary illegitimate intercourse between the races. Arrangements with something of the character of morganatic marriages were common. The children of such unions were usually well taken care of, and often highly educated, not infrequently at Paris. Abroad, they easily passed for white. At home, they had a social life of their own which was not without grace and elegance. But they enjoyed none of the rights of citizenship, and were always enumerated as negroes.

There is no more curious effect of emancipation than the fate which has befallen the survivors and the descendants of this unfortunate class. Their habits and training under slavery had unfitted them for the opportunities which freedom brought; and freedom denied them the peculiar place which slavery had kept open. Some of them made their way to France, where it is probable that their origin is not known. But the greater number were simply driven into the negro quarters of the town; and there they have gradually lost their separateness and ceased to be a class. The faces of their children are darker than theirs; their grandchildren's, darker still. The airs and graces of the half-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world are gone, along with the occupation they were won and worn in. Its shame and its curious distinctions and privileges have been lost together. It must be added that what is true in this peculiar way of New Orleans is true in another way of the other cities of the South. In the lowest of all human competitions, the woman of Africa succumbs to a rivalry more artful and more shameful than her own.

To these general tendencies of town life the towns and cities of the Southwest offer no exceptions. As one passes beyond the coast belt of Texas, the proportion of negroes rapidly lessens, but their preference for the town over the country is even more marked than it is to the eastward. The planters declare that it is impossible to hold them on the plantations. Yet in the towns it is said that the majority of them subsist on the earnings of a small minority who are at work, the women doing more than their part, chiefly as servants and laundresses. For the coming of white men into manual employments is even more marked in Texas than in the older Southern States. As a rule, they control the city trades completely. In Houston, for instance, it is said that the unions would not stop at force and violence if the negroes offered them any troublesome competition.

That, however, is not the situation in most Southern cities. As a rule, the relation of the trades-unions to the race question is quite different; and the writer must confess that the forces engaged in this particular quarter of the field have aligned themselves in a way which to him was altogether surprising. His expectation was that, sooner or later, the negro being excluded from the unions, the race prejudice would reinforce the union man's hatred of the scab, and the labor question would thus take on in the South a character more savage and dangerous than it has ever had in the North. But in this forecast something in the human nature of one or the other race, or of both, was overlooked. The negroes have never ventured into any serious rivalry with the white unions. They do, it is true, form unions among themselves, which are, as it is said, "affiliated" with those of the whites. But what this means in practice is that both unions are controlled by white men. Even when the whites in a particular trade or a particular establishment are only a minority, they have their way. Negroes rarely or never offer to take the place of white men who strike or are locked out. The explanation doubtless is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that, with good reason, they fear white men of the working class worse than they fear employers and capitalists, who frequently belong to the class so often described as the natural protectors of the blacks. It seems to be a fact that white working-men from the North are more bitterly opposed to sharing any occupation with negroes than the native whites are. However, the situation in the Southwest may indicate that when the whites have sufficient numbers to monopolize the city trades they will incline to exclude negroes altogether.

All these things might be true of the towns, and the negro might still be reasonably safe if in the country his place were secure. Southern civilization is still markedly rural. The country still greatly outweighs the town in wealth and in population.

But there is much in the country to strengthen the general inference one naturally makes from what appears in the towns. In the country, also, white men are doing more and more of the work that was formerly left to negroes.

This is particularly true of those parts of Virginia and the Carolinas whence the negroes are migrating Northward so steadily. There are even instances, in those quarters, of large planters and landowners who now make it a rule to have neither negro laborers nor negro tenants, aiming especially to guard against sudden departures. Wherever the new régime has been thus candidly accepted, it seems unlikely that the old will ever be restored. Once free of their long dependence on the African, these people will hardly go back to it of their own accord.

But it is still more important, in any forecast of the future, that one finds a tendency to displace the negro farm-hand and the negro tenant in regions where it cannot be attributed to a voluntary withdrawal of the negroes. If it were not so, one might incline to explain the general invasion of manual employments by white people on the ground of mere necessity, since there is more work to do nowadays than ever before in the South, and relatively fewer negroes to do it. The tendency does appear, however, in quarters where the negroes are increasing, increasing by migration, increasing faster than the whites. It is observable in such strongholds of the African laborer as the Black Belt of Georgia and Alabama, the Yazoo-Mississippi Delta, the valley of the Brazos in Texas.

It is not, in these quarters, the native poor white with whom

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the negro has to reckon. The up-country people, though they are coming into the towns, show little disposition to invade the prairies and the river-bottoms. It is the European, sometimes the German, but oftener the peasant of Southern Europe, particularly the Italian and the Bohemian, whose competition the negro of the cotton and rice and sugar belts, if he were wise, would now be learning to fear. In Texas, he encounters the Mexican also; and, here and there, one hears talk of trying Chinese coolies. But the real threat is from the South of Europe.

Unfortunately, we do not know the proportions of this immigration into the South; but after a survey of the field I am sure that it is already considerable, and the signs are that it is also fast increasing. That is the opinion of railroad and steamship officials and of immigration agents. Even in the towns, effects of it are easily discernible. At least one great railroad system has begun to use Italians instead of negroes for track work, as is done so commonly in the North. The newcomers are also finding their way into mills and factories. But nothing will impress so deeply any one familiar with the life of the Lower South as their appearance in the sugar-fields, the rice-fields, and the cotton-fields.

To understand how the inroad has been made and what it may conceivably herald, it is necessary to understand what the present-day plantation of the Lower South is like. A series of changes have transformed it into a very different affair from what it was under slavery, and for some years after the war. In place of the old-time planter, there is now a landlord. In place of the slave or the hired laborer, there is a tenant: sometimes a "cash tenant," paying a fixed money rental, but oftener a "share tenant," paying his rent with a part of the crop. Instead of a single and single-headed patriarchal community, there are a number of little farms under one ownership. It is true that the landlord retains, occasionally by contract, universally by custom, many of the rights of supervision and control which he had as a planter. He or his overseer is constantly inspecting, advising—in effect, commanding. He usually keeps in his own hands the fencing and draining and general up-keep of his land. It is more than likely that he advances the tenants their supplies. He may even own the tenant's tools and stock, as well as his cabin. Sometimes his control is so nearly complete that it might be more correct to describe the division of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crop as a payment by him to the tenant for his services, than as a payment by the tenant to him for the land. Of course, there is also the small independent farmer, white or black. But the share-tenant plantation is the typical agricultural community of the Cotton Belt.

One of the earliest attempts to introduce the peasant of Southern Europe into this system was made twelve years ago, by the late Mr. Austin Corbin, at Sunnyside Plantation, on the Arkansas side of the Mississippi River. A colony of Italians was brought over, and established in tenantry under contracts which looked to the final purchase of their holdings. Mr. Corbin died, however, before the enterprise was well under way. The men in charge of it were not, it is understood, familiar with local conditions or experienced in plantation management. As first planned and conducted, it failed. But with the failure came a change. Men to the manner born were put in charge. It can be stated to-day, on the best authority, that the experiment of tenant-farming with Italians at Sunnyside is successful from the point of view of the managers and owners, brilliantly successful from the point of view of the immigrants themselves. They have mastered quickly what they had to learn about the growing of cotton and the other crops. They have endured the climate. They have proved both more industrious and more thrifty than the negroes about them. Though they began with nothing, a number now own the land they cultivate. Several have bank-accounts running into the thousands. Some are sending money home to pay debts or to bring over their kin.

It is probable that the Sunnyside colony was selected with some care, and from the thrifty peasant farmers of the interior of Italy. Quite likely, therefore, these people are superior to the mass of Italian emigrants to this country, drawn mainly from Sicily and the lower end of the Peninsula. But what has happened at Sunnyside is happening at too many other places to be regarded any longer as extraordinary. One instance is carefully described in a Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor.* At Calumet, a sugar-plantation in Louisiana, none but negro labor was employed up to eight years ago. Since then there has been a gradual displacement of the negroes by Italians. It does not appear that either there or at Sunnyside the blacks are stimulated

* No. 38. "The Negroes of Cinclare and Calumet." By J. B. Laws.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the example and competition of the newcomers to work harder or to save money. It is found, too, that more Italian than negro children work in the fields, and at harder labor. I have heard of Italian tenants who, after harvesting their own crops, have hired themselves as cotton-pickers to negro tenants who were behindhand. It has come to be a common saying, where the ways of both races are known, that if an Italian earns a dollar and a quarter he will spend the quarter and save the dollar, but that if a negro earns the same amount he will spend—a dollar and a half.*

The Italian as laborer and tenant on the plantation of the Lower South is no longer an experiment. It is clear that as a rule he does the work at least as well as the negro, and that he is more likely to save money and become a landowner. The testimony concerning Bohemians is quite as favorable. The success of the large German colonies in Texas, Alabama, and other parts of the South has long been established. Yet it is true that many planters, probably a majority, still prefer the negro, and particularly the uneducated negro, both as laborer and as tenant.

Explanations, however, are not far to seek. There is custom, tradition, prejudice. There is, in most cases, a genuine fondness for negroes. There is the habit of command, to which the negro makes the least resistance. Moreover, by the system of advances, the planter can be reasonably sure of obtaining from negro tenants what are called "speculative profits," that is to say, interest on advances. The Italian tenant very soon saves enough to do without advances. Though the negro may be always in debt, he rarely fails, in the long run, to pay; and he is usually too poor a trader to get the best of a bargain—which the Italian frequently does. These considerations may for some time operate to keep the negro in the plantation system. But they will not suffice to keep the invaders out. For all over the South the demand for tenants and farm laborers outruns the supply.

This is, I know, but a scattering and incomplete arrayal of the

* Italian emigration to the South seems at present to be entering on a new phase. Acting for the Italian government, Il Cavaliere A. Rossi and G. Rossati and Professor A. Ravaioli have been carefully studying the opportunities which various sections hold out to their countrymen, particularly to agriculturists. Their reports are so favorable to parts of the Southern States that Baron Mayor des Planches, the Italian Ambassador, has heartily endorsed an organized movement to turn Italians in that direction. I wish there were space to use the information concerning this most interesting enterprise which Baron Mayor has kindly placed at my disposal.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

observations which have convinced me that the large province the negro has always held in the industry of the Southern States is now being formidably invaded. I think, however, that enough has been given to show that his place in the South's industrial system can no longer be regarded as secure. Five years ago, Principal Washington declared that the next twenty years were going to be the most serious in the history of his race. "Within this period," he said, "it will be largely decided whether the negro will be able to retain the hold which he now has upon the industries of the South, or whether his place will be filled by white people from a distance." The wisdom of the forecast is already proved; yet it neglected the native poor white.

All that I have said has been by way of showing that the negro has lost ground. But without his losing some ground no invasion could have occurred; and to say that it has occurred is not to say that he cannot resist it. Principal Washington is himself still undismayed. The apparent loss is, he holds, rather relative than absolute; it is largely explained by the South's rapid development and the gains of the whites in mere numbers. He is also cheered by the entrance of negroes into higher and higher employments, such as clerkships, stenography, and various branches of "business." My belief is, however, that it is nearly always mulattoes who rise in the industrial scale. It is probable, too, that the negroes have the same doubtful advantage that women have when they offer for the work of men. They will accept lower wages.

It is in trying to determine how much ground the negro has lost that we turn most naturally to the statisticians. Unfortunately, the census-gatherers leave unasked many questions we should like to see answered; and some of the changes I have been describing are so recent that the returns of five years ago may have been but little affected by them. All that has been said of the townward movement among both races, and of the Northward movement of the negroes is, however, sufficiently confirmed. But it is the tables dealing with occupations which seem most apposite. I shall not attempt to analyze them. It is safer to rest on the careful inferences of the experts.* It should be explained that the term

* The bulk of the Report is the work of Professor Walter F. Willcox, of Cornell University, doubtless the first authority in the country on statistics concerning negroes. Professor Dubois, of Atlanta University, in his chapter on "The Negro Farmer," is not less rigidly scientific.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"negroes," as used in the returns, covers all races other than the white. For the South, however, the error involved in the failure to distinguish among colored peoples cannot be great.

In 1900, more than two-thirds of all the negroes engaged in remunerative occupations in the Southern States were in the three classes described as "laborers," "agricultural laborers," and "farmers, planters, and overseers." Within the decade, the number of negro "laborers" had increased by more than 60 per cent., the "agricultural laborers" by 22.3 per cent., the "farmers, planters, and overseers" by 31.1 per cent. The increase in the first class does not look hopeful, but the boundary lines between the three classes are so vague and shifting that reasoning about them from the tables is discouraged. The same difficulty is found with certain other classes. There are also certain occupations, such as teaching and the Christian ministry, in which there is no appreciable competition between the races. In yet a third group, including such large classes as the hostlers, the masons, and the porters and helpers in stores, no figures by races for the Southern States alone were given in 1890. It appears, however, that in the case of at least fourteen leading occupations the figures for the two census years reveal the true course of an actual competition.

In five of those occupations, while both races gained, the negroes gained more rapidly than the whites. This was true of the class known as "servants and waiters," of the miners and quarrymen, of the nurses and midwives, of the iron and steel workers, and of the operatives in sawmills and planing-mills. In the other nine occupations, the negroes lost ground relatively to the whites. That is to say, the proportion of negroes among the draymen, truckmen and teamsters in the South, among the steam-railroad employees, among the operatives in tobacco and cigar factories, among the fishermen and oystermen, among the engineers and firemen of other than locomotive engines, among the barbers and hair-dressers, among the launderers and laundresses, among the seamstresses, and among the carpenters and joiners, was less in 1900 than it was in 1890. In the two classes last named, there was an absolute decrease in the number of negroes. The figures for the whole country show also that there were fewer negro blacksmiths in 1900 than in 1890; and there is no reason to suppose that what was true of the whole country was not true of the Southern States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The census tables, therefore, strengthen rather than weaken the inference from actual observation. So far as they throw any light at all on the inquiry, they indicate that five years ago the negroes were losing rather than gaining ground in the industries of the South. It is disappointing that they do not yield more positive inferences concerning the great group of occupations covered by the general term "agriculture." We have, however, in the annual assessment lists of several Southern States which take account of the race to which each taxpayer belongs, some fairly safe material for an estimate of the negro's place in the greatest of Southern industries.

The Georgia assessments have been closely studied, and they seem to show that in the matter of acquiring land the negroes of that State are not now progressing as fast as they were at an earlier period of their history as freemen. In 1874, the negroes of Georgia owned, all together, more than a third of a million acres. In seven years from that date, the amount was doubled. Ten years later, in 1891, the total passed a million acres. But at the end of the next decade there was practically no increase at all. The figures for the total wealth of the Georgia negroes, from year to year, parallel closely the figures for land alone. There is an increase, gradual, but not constant, up to the early nineties; but for the next decade a slight positive decrease. However, it appears that the wealth of the white people of Georgia also declined in the nineties. It cannot be said, therefore, that negroes have been falling behind in the accumulation of property in general. But it is not clear that their failure to go on acquiring land is accounted for by the general shrinkage in values revealed by the assessments.

Moreover, they are in no position to be content with merely holding their own. Their own in Georgia is less than three per cent. of all the land included in farms, and but little more than three per cent. of the total wealth—and they are nearly half the population. True, they began only forty years ago, and with nothing. But the whites also were at that time wofully impoverished. Is it reasonable to suppose that the disparity would now be nearly so great as it is if the two races were of equal capacity for accumulation? If the disparity does not rapidly grow less, can it be contended that the negro is proving his case as a freeman, as an American?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For that, after all, in our commercial, industrial democracy, is the supreme test by which the negro's future on the American continent will be determined. The change which, if my observation is not egregiously at fault, is now coming over the industries of the South, is not merely an invasion of the negro's occupations. It is, rather, a change of standards of efficiency in work; and the negro's hope of rising, his chance of even holding his own, depends on his ability to live up to the new standard. With the increase of population, and a keener and keener struggle for wealth, the standard of industry, of skill, and of thrift will approximate more and more closely that of the Northern States and of the West of Europe. The white man whom the negro has to fear is no longer the man who would force him to work. It is the man who would take his work away from him. The danger, the immediate menace, is from rivalry rather than oppression.

But this is not to say that oppression, past and present, has nothing to do with the situation. The social and political status of the negro must certainly be considered. If it were different, his showing in industry might also be different. Some, no doubt, will hold that the characteristics which handicap him most heavily in the struggle are those he got from slavery. That opinion, however, is not so common as it used to be. It is now freely conceded, even by leading negroes, that the training of slavery may have been as good a preparation for the race's present opportunities as any that this unregulated world of men could ever conceivably have vouchsafed it. The negroes of America were in this way immeasurably advanced beyond the competence of their fellows in Africa. Nine Southern employers out of ten will still declare that they prefer the laborer who has been a slave to the younger representatives of freedom. No doubt, an exception must be made of the graduates of schools like Hampton and Tuskeegee. The testimony of those who know at first hand the work and the lives of these young men and young women is almost uniformly favorable. They are, however, but a little leaven in so great a mass. They cannot be treated as representatives, for, apart from their exceptional training, they may be said to have been, in a sense, selected.

But whatever we may decide about the effects of slavery, it is clear, I think, that the denials which they endure under the caste system work, on the whole, unfavorably to the negroes in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

struggle for wealth. The sum of the matter seems to be that life does not offer to them the same inducements to endeavor which it offers to the white men about them. In the struggle for the things of this world, the negro is not lured on, as the white man is, by the vision of the kingdoms of this world, and the glory of them. It is a common and no doubt a correct observation that he is weak in the desire and purpose of self-betterment. But desire is generally in some degree proportioned to its objects, and purpose to its opportunities. Black men, I suppose, cannot help feeling that what they can win from life is always short of what they might win if they were white. I do not believe that the mass of them are agonized with the sense of denial quite as white men would be in their place. But may not the sting of it be keenest in those very men and women who, because they aspire most, must be counted on to do the most to lift up themselves and their fellows? The caste arrangement which has succeeded slavery is of necessity, in some measure, deadening to ambition. On the other hand, it does not give the white man, as slavery did, the power, and the individually selfish motive, to make the negro work.

It has, no doubt, its compensations. There is sense in saying that to exclude the negro from politics was a good way to get him to work. He, like other human beings, probably works at times for the mere reason that there is nothing else in particular to do. It is also quite probably true that in his present stage he works best, as he fights best, under the eyes of those he looks to as superiors. Perhaps, from his low place in the social system, he exaggerates the happiness he would have in a higher, somewhat as the ignorant exaggerate the advantages of being learned. Possibly, if he were made in all things the white man's equal, he would lapse from those Caucasian ideals which attract him from above. But all these advantages of his being underneath, real as they may be, are, I think, more than offset by the practical uses white men may make of their superior station and their control over all branches of government. In the courts of law, for instance, it is said that the property rights of the negro are protected quite as well as the white man's; but this is not true of his person, of his life. The negro assailant of a white man rarely escapes his punishment; the white assailant of a negro far too frequently does. Moreover, in all business dealings, selfishness is to be pre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sumed. If white men, in their business dealings with negroes, never stoop to profit by their ascendency through caste, then human nature has been sadly maligned.

It must, I think, be admitted that the competition is unequal. But it does not help the negro to dwell on the handicap he carries, whether from the past fact of slavery or the present fact of caste. Even if it should prove true that the heaviest handicap of all is his distinctly racial characteristics, entirely apart from his history in America, he might be no better off for admitting it. A wiser Godspeed is to tell him that his best chance, if not, indeed, his sole chance, of lifting himself, socially and politically, is precisely the chance he has of winning in the competition which is now being forced upon him. If he would strive for the best place he can have in our American life, the way to it lies through work and saving.

The misery of all our debating about him is that we cannot honestly pretend to be glad that he is here, or to desire that his seed shall increase. Yet surely we can afford the honesty of telling him the truth. Let us tell him, at least, that it is idle to put his faith in party platforms or laws of Congress or amendments to the Constitution. Let us tell him that if he would have the white man's ballot or the white man's culture, if he would exact from white men, across the line of caste, fair dealing and considerate treatment, he must learn to match the white man's industry, his shrewdness, his forethought of the morrow. Were the admonition harsher, it would be more sincere. If he would keep the foothold he has now among us, if he would survive and live, and look to see his children live after him, he must put money in his purse.

William Garrott Brown.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NIETZSCHE AND THE "WILL TO POWER."

BY VERNON LEE.

THE fact that Friedrich Nietzsche, when released from life at only fifty-six, had already survived his reasonable soul by nearly eleven years, disposes of his philosophy with miraculous satisfactoriness for some of his opponents. But it is liable to make those feel almost abashed who do not relish such cheap irony on the part of Fate.

I wish to make it plain, therefore, that, though the final catastrophe of this great mind appears to me to have had constitutional causes and preliminary symptoms which affected the doomed man's manner of being and therefore of thinking, yet it is my conviction that the psychological interest and moral importance of what, following his own example, I venture to designate as "the Case of Nietzsche" would have been quite as real, though less vulgarly obvious, had it never been rounded off by so frightful a logico-dramatic coincidence. If, therefore, I proceed to deal with Nietzsche's philosophy as the expression of spiritual and bodily unhealthiness, let it be understood that I am referring only to the kind of madness which Nietzsche's Wise Man prayed for—"Give me, ye Powers, madness, that I may believe in myself!"—and not at all to the miserable obliteration of mind with which an atrocious and stupid destiny was preparing to answer that prayer. For it is with this "madness that he might believe in himself" that I intend to deal in the following pages.

The soundest and, therefore, the most living and fertile part of a philosopher's work is, perhaps, that which makes him not unlike, but like, his fellows; nay the possibility of being assimilated by the future is, in many cases, in direct proportion to the fact of having been assimilated from the past. But my object, in the present study, has not been the extracting of what I consider the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most valuable productions of Nietzsche's extraordinary mind; all the various "selections, philosophies and quintessences" of Nietzsche are amply sufficient in their unintentional misrepresentation of him as a typically sane, sound and socially normal thinker. My object has been, on the contrary, to collect into a synthetic group those peculiarities which differentiate him from nearly all other equally great thinkers; peculiarities which bring him into conflict, not merely, as he gloried in feeling, with the mental habits of hypocrites, Philistines and decadents, but with the modes of thinking and feeling indispensable for the continuance of the human race, and as such deeply ingrained in the human race's composition. I desire, in short, to see what was at the bottom of Nietzsche's characteristic views of life, in order to judge whether life is likely to cultivate or to weed out this type of philosophy and this type of philosopher.

"There is no Will to Existence," says Zarathustra; "for what does not yet exist, cannot will; and, as to that which does exist, how could it possibly will to exist?"

Besides a combination of a truism ("that which does not exist, cannot will") with an entirely unproven assumption ("that which does exist cannot will to exist"), we have here a confusion between an abstract, metaphorical statement and an individual concrete fact. Philosophically speaking, no one has ever attributed to the individual human being dominant, unfailing desire for continued existence, so that its denial cannot be the core of Zarathustra's supreme discovery; and we must look for that in the denial of that metaphorical Will under which the genius of Schopenhauer adumbrated the great generalizations of modern biology. The necessity of growing, reproducing, varying, adapting, of surviving at any price, this, and this only, can be called the Will to Existence. But this is an abstraction, an allegory, though a perfectly fitting one, and the Will to Existence can be postulated, and has been postulated, only of that abstract and allegorical entity, the Species. For this Will to Existence Nietzsche, in probably conscious contradiction to his discarded master, tries therefore to substitute a Will to Power; and the form of speech renders such a substitution superficially possible; Will is will, and you need only write "Power" after effacing "Existence." But this operation is a delusion or a piece of trickery, an attempt at exchanging things which do not belong to the same category.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Looking at that abstraction called "the Species," and expressing our generalizations about it under the metaphorical form of Will, we are struck immediately by the utter indifference manifested by the Species to any such relation as is implied by the word "Power"; and by the metaphorical readiness which the Species displays, on the contrary, for proceedings absolutely negatived by the word "Power": a readiness to alter, to dwindle, to lie low, to degenerate, to submit to any tyranny, privation or parasitic condition, or even to self-mutilation, rather than allow itself to die. Indeed, the survival through self-effacement, as distinguished from self-assertion (and power implies self-assertion), is so frequent an occurrence in the life of Species, that I cannot read Nietzsche's description of the methods towards survival attributed by him to primitive Christian communities, without thinking of some naturalist's account of a sort of animal which, after living in decent independence on land or in water, has got itself imprisoned, by the ruthless Will to Existence, in the diseased body of some more powerful kind of creature. So that, if Zarathustra meant to replace Schopenhauer's great Will, the Will to Existence, tingling (as we seem to feel it) throughout the universe, by his more "*vornehm*" Will to Power, he must take back his remark; for Nature cares nothing for his new scale of values.

Nor is this all. The Will to Power may and does exist as an individual phenomenon. But (and here we begin our real examination of Nietzsche's views in reference to that very "Life," which he thought he so aristocratically accepted), whatever exists in the individual is, speaking metaphorically, yet very correctly, subject to the Will of the Species; and the Will of the Species is, as we have seen, the mere Will to Existence. Like any other peculiarity, the Will to Power develops so long as it conduces to survival, and atrophies to the extent to which it becomes a danger.

Thus the Will to Existence, of which, as of all other divinities, the exclusive pride of Nietzsche would not brook the reality, shows itself to be a god of most ruthless practicality, and every other kind of volition, every instinct, habit or tendency of living creatures, all the *demiurgi*, Olympian or subterranean, can hold their sway only at its inexorable behest.

Translated into prosaic literalness, the question may therefore be stated as follows: Does the predominance of self-consciousness

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the assertion of the ego, which, taken together, constitute Nietzsche's Will to Power, offer such advantages to the human race as to have fostered this Will to Power to an exorbitant degree in the past, or as to foster it, so far as we can foresee, to still completer supremacy in the future? We may get an approximate answer to this question in the course of examining some of the mental and emotional tendencies and habits which Nietzsche condemns in mankind, as the unworthy rivals to the Will to Power, and perhaps arrive at some conclusion by subsequently glancing also at the position which Nietzsche takes up towards life as a whole, that is to say, towards that Will to Existence of which he so rudely denies the existence.

First and foremost among the opponents to the Will to Power is what we may roughly sum up as Duty. Conspicuous among the prophecies of Zarathustra are those concerning the great Lion from out of the desert, who fights and destroys the great Dragon whose wings are inscribed with commandments. "Thou Shalt" is the name of the great Dragon, but the spirit of the Lion says, "I Will." While busy demolishing the Free Will of Christian and of Kantian ethics, Nietzsche had himself made a superb demonstration of the fundamental identity of that Lion "I Will" and that Dragon "Thou Shalt"; or, rather, he had shown that neither the Lion nor the Dragon had any kind of real existence. But, taken upon the plane of the illusion inevitable in our feeling, such a seeming division and opposition between the inner and the outer Will can and must be recognized; and Nietzsche could legitimately split up the chimæra, Free Will, into the solitary, rebellious Lion and the obsequious, Philistine Dragon. But, if we are to discuss not the metaphysics of Free Will, but the phenomenon of apparent alternative as manifest in experience, the question of *Thou Shalt* and *I Will* takes a different aspect. There is more than a rough and ready practicality (*"pour encourager les autres,"* like Voltaire's court martial on Admiral Byng) in the legal limitation of responsibility to such individuals as are neither idiots nor maniacs. For, as the appearance of volition exists only in the face of two conceivable modes of action, which imply Consciousness, there can be no will, no choice, in cases where the instincts have the blind, automatic action of reflexes. There is, therefore, a greater appearance of volition in obeying a law and conforming to a standard than in acting under the undivided pres-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sure of a habit or an appetite. Nietzsche was thoroughly aware of all this, and had, moreover, the proud and combative and self-centred man's excessive and unphilosophical scorn for anything like habits, blind instincts and reflexes. He therefore formulated (I was going to write: "he was therefore *obliged* to formulate," but these are words he never would have admitted with reference to himself) something opposed to obscure instinctive preferences, but opposed also to all categorical imperatives: an individual standard and law (including pretended subversion of all previous standards and laws), a private categorical imperative so rigid that slavery, degradation, Dantesque dung-ponds of ignominy, were the ineluctable punishment of their non-recognition; let alone, of course, a fine preliminary bout of Zarathustrian philosophizing on them "with the hammer."

Thus Nietzsche was never able to carry his individualism (as his predecessor Stirner had done) to its logical conclusion of anarchy inside as well as outside the individual. He committed the inconsequence (to which we owe some of his most beautiful and perhaps immortal sentences) of preaching the most rigorous hierarchy, and hierarchic commanding and obeying, within the soul of the lawbreaker himself. I call this an inconsequence, and hope to demonstrate that it was one; fruitful, moreover, like many of the inconsequences of one-sided thinkers. Nietzsche, of course, asserted that this régime of categorical imperatives was the outcome, solely, of the individual himself; and that the Zarathustrian person (to say nothing of the eventually coming "Über-Mensch") went through this noviciate of purifications, professed this *rule* of vigils and chastenings (so singular in a theoretic opponent of asceticism) for the simple gratification of his own fine gentleman's *taste*. But, if we look at facts, this superlative Zarathustrian "good form" (for as such this moral Beau Brummell gives it us) is, like every other kind of *good form*, a product for which no isolated individuality could suffice, and for which no pressure of merely individual preference could originally account. It is essentially an historical, sociological product. Intent upon his own moral posturings and gestures (in which the old Stoical mantle and even sundry Christian *academic* properties, were unconsciously made use of), Nietzsche found it convenient to take for granted the ready-made Zarathustrian individual, attitudes, gestures, good taste and all; and therefore averted his glance from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the genesis and evolution thereof. For, in that genesis and evolution of Zarathustra's "good taste," the principal part had been played throughout the centuries by that which Nietzsche most furiously disliked (reserving it to explain only the Socratic, Christian, Kantian or other unclean spirits)—namely, the race at large, the instincts, claims and habits of the majority of human beings so utterly offensive to Nietzsche's sense of smell and somewhat queasy stomach. And, in a way, Nietzsche actually placed himself in the impossibility of denying such villainous origin, which a thoroughpaced anarchic thinker like Stirner would have made short work of, together with formulas, standards and good taste of any kind.

Nietzsche, as was inevitable in one who frankly objected to gods of all sorts—because, "if there were gods, how could he have endured not being one of them?"—Nietzsche, filling up his own horizon, had pretty well sent Nature (and the Will to Existence) to the Coventry of the Lucretian gods, and very rarely referred to her or it. But the possession of the finest taste unfortunately requires, not merely recognition, but a standard; and thus the isolated superfine individual was betrayed into calling on Nature's testimony to the correctness of his moral attitude and manner. "All the audacity, the fineness and keenness that have ever existed," he writes, "all the masterly certainty and dancelike spirit, have developed themselves, thanks to the tyranny of such self-imposed law *(Willkür-Gesetze)* and it is by no means improbable that just this, and not a system of *laissez-aller,* is *nature* and *natural.*" Nietzsche did not know how large a door he was opening in this second part of the sentence: a door, a gate, through which what should sweep in but that deposed, rejected, utterly banished Will to Existence? For, if the individual has not grown as a mere random jumble of uncoordinated instincts, this is explained by his not existing as an isolated individual, companionless, *in vacuo.* Man is, more or less, a composite and orderly whole because he is an integral part of a whole which can be only composite and orderly. *Naturalness,* which Nietzsche invoked as a final condemnation of spiritual anarchy, is merely a word for suitability to the ways of other things, adaptation to that great abstract whole which allows insubordinate doings neither in single individuals nor in single instincts. The *law-to-himself* of the finer human being is the expression of a more perfect and well-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nigh automatic adaptation to the hierarchy outside. Nay, far below the sphere of such ethical good form, we find concentric circles of inner coordination, without which we could not move, stand, digest or grow, let alone perceive, feel, think or will. But if there did not exist, if there had not existed for æons, creatures more or less similar around us, if the universe had cared to produce only isolated higher individuals, or Super-Men, would there have been a need for such a complex form of life; a need for reactions, so intricate and so subordinate to one another; a need for perception, will or thought; an opening, so to speak, for such superfine moral manners?

After the great Dragon, Duty, let us pass on to the consideration of what Nietzsche regards as the vilest of all small moral worms: Humility. The word "worm" is appropriate; for Nietzsche derives its origin from the practical wisdom of rolling up and shamming death in order to avoid a second crushing. Granted, as is very possible, that such is its real genealogy, there comes the question, why Nature (for even Nietzsche has unwillingly to admit that there is Nature) should have preserved this particular ditch-begotten little virtue. The answer is, simply, that Humility happens to afford an excellent corrective for a particular optical illusion to which the human being, Mensch or Über-Mensch, is condemned (with danger to his comfort and even his existence), by a trifling peculiarity of his constitution. I am alluding, of course, to the fact that we, all of us, happen to be enclosed in our own skin, and are therefore aware of our own existence in a more direct, intimate and forcible manner than of the existence of others. Those others, meanwhile, similarly enclosed, are afflicted by the selfsame unevenness of perception: the inside, namely oneself, is thoroughly visible, audible, intelligible and imperative; the outside, or not-oneself, becomes an accessory or background, and tends perpetually to vanish altogether. The virtue or vice of Humility serves to reverse, in part, this natural, but by no means objectively correct, perspective; and thereby tends to diminish the wear and tear, nay, the sometimes fatal accidents, which it must otherwise occasion. The fact of being what house-agents call "self containing," makes us, each and all, the most important thing we can conceive. Humility whispers that, on the contrary, we are very probably by far the most unimportant thing in all the universe, and thereby halves our natural

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pretensions to something nearer our objective bulk and power. In this manner it enables us to find room to stand in, to thread our way among those too-too solid ghosts, our fellow men, to exchange place, to move, to expand even—in short, to live. This is the service rendered by Humility, and this is why Humility has been fostered by the racial Will to Existence, by the great *demiurgus,* Life, who shuts his eyes to baseness of origin and primæval worm-wriggling; Life, well aware that, if the haughty genealogist went far enough in his researches, he would find wrigglings of some kind, and animals less aristocratic than worms, in the first chapter of the most distinguished family histories.

The reason why Life can be less squeamish than Nietzsche, and yet, somehow, maintain a certain æsthetic dignity and have as grand an air as any Zarathustra brandishing his Will to Power, is that Life possesses the secret of great transmutations, transfigurations, of which Nietzsche gradually lost the very conception. After Humility, Compassion is, in his eyes, the vilest and most vicious of Christian virtues. Sickness, weakness, says Nietzsche, requires only one thing, to be cleared away. That depends, common sense has avowed for centuries, in fact for æons, how sick the sick, how weak the weak. It is the strength of the weak man, the healthiness of the organs still free from disease, to which Compassion addresses itself, and which, with help and time, effects survival and recovery. Nay, what we look upon as symptoms of disease, or as faintings and failings of weakness, are frequently, in the moral order as well as the bodily, adaptations to a difficult crisis, diminished claims, nay, even inverted instincts, fostered by the great Will to Existence. Take the Imitation of Christ, that almost complete, perhaps because almost posthumous, manifesto of the millenarian and ascetic and self-humiliating sides of Christianity. To us, particularly to us when in health and prosperity, it may have a taste which is mawkish, a taste of physic, if not of poison; but for centuries it was, and in individual cases (till wisdom and gentleness invent a better compound) it still remains a pain-killer, a sleeping-draught which has saved from death or from madness. Christianity as defined by Nietzsche—that is to say, Christianity in its most questionable and perishable aspect—constituted, after all, only one of the many *modus vivendi* which the race made for itself at various stages of its difficult existence: regimens of brutality and narrow-mindedness or of self-suppres-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sion and mystic stultification, Spartan, early Aryan, early Hebraic, Buddhist, Christian—all representing a mutilation or a narcotizing of some one of the soul's possibilities; each of them furnishing, in its turn, a balance of desirable effects over effects undesirable or actually pernicious. Looked at dispassionately, there is no grosser falsehood in the notion that the individual ego is necessarily sinful, than in the notion that the individual tribe or caste or race is necessarily impeccable; nor is it more lopsided to give unto others what would be best employed by oneself, than to take away from others what might best be employed by them. Indeed, one may ask oneself whether Tolstoy, let us say, is really less of a human being, if he is really more warped and maimed, more of a cripple and a monster than—well, than Nietzsche.

Let us leave the ground of human duty and virtue, and pass on, "Beyond Good and Evil," to that which Nietzsche considered the only real one: the ground of human greatness. What did Nietzsche make of the Human Work? The *work*, which is the test and the reason of Carlyle's Hero and of Renan's Prospero-Sage, had no intrinsic interest in Nietzsche's eyes, no place in his philosophy. Its importance for him was merely as an expression of what he very erroneously took it to be, the outcome of an individual temperament, the manifestation of a Will to Power. Now, Nietzsche did not really want any Will to Power except his own, and he had a positively morbid dislike to coming in contact with other people's temperament. It is understating the case to say that nineteen out of every twenty references he makes to the work of other men are expressions of aversion, contempt or disgust; and it is no mere coincidence that his ideal, Zarathustra, in all we are told about his life, preaches, reviles, laughs, dances, nay, even lets himself once or twice be lured into the deadly sin of pity, but on no single occasion extracts pleasure or profit from any other human being or any human being's work. The assimilation of other men's greatness, the enriching oneself by appreciation, is never mentioned as part of the processes of growth of the great man, of the Super-Man. His relations, when not of scorn and destruction, are entirely confined to his own solitary person; he develops merely by wrestling with himself and by expressing himself; he remains (even if multiplied to a possible race of Super-Men) not merely isolated and solitary, but virtually alone in the universe; a colossal Michelangelesque figure, with immense sinews

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and rather academic draperies, filling up a narrow background entirely devoid of vegetation, houses, or any incident except two or three symbolical animals; he stands or, as Nietzsche represents him, he dances, in a dignified manner though a dreary one; and, when he is not inveighing against the sickening peculiarities of the human race he has turned his back upon, he is engaged in the one act for which he specially exists. The Super-Man says "'Yes' to life." But, before inquiring into the precise nature of this "'Yes' to life," let us forestall all possibility of its being mistaken for any kind of philosophic or poetical act of contemplation of life's loveliness or mystery. The more so that we shall incidentally gain some further, and some terribly significant, insight into the temperament with which Nietzsche himself had to face life. Here is his "genesis" of the *Vita Contemplativa:*

"In primitive times, the individual, conscious of his own strength, is busy translating his feelings and thoughts *(Vorstellungen)* into acts, as in hunting, robbing, aggression, ill-usage and murder, without counting such fainter imitations of such proceedings as he finds tolerated within his own community." (Here I must open a parenthesis to remark upon the utter overlooking by Nietzsche of an activity which must necessarily have been enormously developed in primitive times, the activity of invention and manual dexterity.) "But if his vigor diminish," proceeds Nietzsche in his account of the primæval man, "if he feel tired or sick or depressed or oversatiated, and therefore momentarily delivered of desire, then he becomes a comparatively better, that is to say, more harmless, creature. It is in this condition that he becomes a thinker and a reader of the future. But his thoughts, all the products of his mind, must necessarily reflect his momentary condition, that is to say, the beginning of cowardice and fatigue, the diminished importance in his feelings of activity and enjoyment." Let us examine this statement. Nietzsche identifies, quite unwarrantably, the normal satisfaction of appetite with queasy and languid indigestion: according to him, the Berserker at rest must be the sick Berserker. Nietzsche has no recognition of the obvious fact that, in the healthy creature, the satisfaction of a want does not in the least mean the exhaustion of an energy (he sophistically or perhaps merely characteristically, *autobiographically,* identifies desire for objects with desire for action), and that, shelter, food, the first necessaries once obtained, this energy will be at liberty,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will go into other things, useful inventions, mechanical work, and, those having given their result, into the superfluous pleasantness of play, art and thought. Nietzsche is even guilty of self-contradiction. He certainly seems to consider activity as due to a desire for asserting power; yet he supposes activity to flag with the satisfaction of definite material wants. However this be, he entirely ignores the fact of the transmission to another employment of whatever energy is liberated by the cessation of a want, a fact which is at the root of human history, and explains all the successive complexities of human activity, bodily and mental. But having established the origin of the *Vita Contemplativa,* of thought, imagination, all the higher powers, in the slackness and nausea of the savage weary of violence and sick with surfeit, "*Pudenda origo!*" he has the audacity to exclaim at his own libellous account! Having done this, he continues his attack on the life of the spirit by asserting that men of genius poison normal life by their demand for exceptional moments. "In the same manner," he says, "as we see savages exterminating themselves by the use of alcohol, so mankind as a whole and in its more important qualities *(im ganzen und grossen)* has been slowly but thoroughly corrupted by the spiritual alcoholics of intoxicating feelings, and by the craving therefor. Who knows? Perhaps mankind will even be exterminated thereby."

Thought, sympathetic perception, inventive calculation, imaginative and æsthetic joy, all that spiritual activity which enriches life, enabling it to bring forth more, demanding less weariness and waste, substituting enjoyment which can be shared for enjoyment which must be fought for—all this an alcoholic unfitting mankind to live! Alas, alas! How deep must be the disease which thus converts his fellow creatures' best food into mere poison for this wretched Nietzsche's nerves! "*Pudenda origo!*" one may, indeed, exclaim, not of the spiritual life, but of this man's view of it. We can now understand what Nietzsche's "saying 'Yes' to life" implies, and, incidentally, how it comes to be the culmination of a creed whose basis, as Nietzsche has told us, is "a certain pleasure in saying 'No.'"

According to Nietzsche's belief, under the rubric of the "Eternal Return," every item and every concatenation of items of the universe's existence is bound to repeat itself in cycles of absolutely precise similarity. By this doctrine, therefore, Nietzsche is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enabled (however unconsciously) to withdraw the one ideal and the one consolation which he had apparently conceded to the weakness of all philosophers: the Über-Mensch and his "Yes" will indeed come, have indeed come, an infinity of times already; but the Über-Mensch and his "Yes" also pass, have passed, must pass, and be succeeded by a Da Capo, eternal like his comings and goings, of everything that is not Über-Mensch and not "'Yes' to life." This cosmic fact, as Nietzsche affects to consider it, implies necessarily a return of all those things which the Über-Mensch appeared to have cleared away; indeed, the eight days' illness which the discovery of the Eternal Return cost Zarathustra is very clearly referred to that almost Über-Mensch's recognition of the return—infinitely repeated—of the meanness of spirit, the sympathy and desire for sympathy, the pity and humility, all the slave's-morality of that plebeian civilization which offended the aristocratic Nietzsche by its stuffiness and evil smell. And it is this next to intolerable fact, it is this revolting habit on the part of "Life," to which, above all else, the famous "Yes" of the Super-Man is to be addressed with singing and dancing. The "'Yes' to life," therefore, implies, quite consonantly with all we know of Nietzsche's tendencies, a "No" not merely to all human hope and consolation, but a violent "No" to the assenting Über-Mensch's preferences and wishes. In fact, by an unexpected turn, we find that the "tendency to say 'No,'" the "deliberate ruthlessness" which Nietzsche had attributed to the original thinker, has presented us, at the hands of the denouncer of all asceticism and pessimism, with a new variety of the doctrine of renunciation.

"Not merely," says Nietzsche, "to endure the inevitable, still less to hide it from ourselves . . . *but to love it.*" The thought has never, perhaps, been put in a more striking form; but the thought is old, and it has seen an enormous amount of service, because it has been, on occasion, a very consoling one. It runs through all Stoical literature, descending from the strained but magnificent reasonableness of Epictetus and Aurelius down to a denial of evil, like that of American Faith-Healers; it takes another form, but remains essentially the same, in the Christian notion of Providence and resignation, in all the paraphrases of Dante's "*In la sua voluntade è nostra pace;*" it reappears as Goethe's "*Entbehren sollst du,*" and has even quite recently been dished up, a judicious mixture of Pagan and Christian, by that exquisite

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

concocter of not very fresh moral and poetic dainties, M. Maeterlinck. And the ubiquitousness, the tenacity, of this doctrine is surely explicable by its belonging, most probably, to a category for which Ibsen has coined a name, to its being, although in the highest and most philosophical sense, a "vital lie"; one of those human inventions for making life's occasional difficulties seem easier: a drug, a tonic, a stimulant or a sedative; not by any means a poison, but very far from being wholesome daily bread. Every form of the doctrine of renunciation, of saying "Yes" to that which naturally provokes a "No," has undoubtedly done great service, and still must do, to mankind; making the human being, if not more fruitful, at all events (upon the whole) less weedy, less parasitic and, in so far, less wasteful of his neighbor's time and his neighbor's strength. But it seems to have the drawback of every lie, even of vital lies, the drawback, crudely, of not corresponding with facts. The facts are that combinations do occur which are dangerous to human life and power, and that pain and the revolt against pain have evolved themselves because they diminish the frequency of such evil combinations.

Sensitiveness to pain and abhorrence thereof are necessary; and, if they require occasional overcoming, it is merely to guard against some greater or more universal evil. It is right, therefore, despite Nietzsche, that there should be pity for others; and right, even more, despite the Stoics, that there should be pity for ourselves. In the real "'Yes' to life" (not Zarathustra's sham one) there must even be implied a "No," instinctive, passionate, even more than reasoned, against such of life's items as are hostile to its completeness and duration.

By all means, therefore, let us play a game of skill and patience with Destiny; turn Fate's moves into gains when we can, and learn from our losses to play better in the future. But let us guard against the temptation, subtle and strong to our inertness and to our vanity, of thinking, or pretending to think, that we can always gain. Making the best of things is intelligent and dignified, it is, above all, practical; but beyond this begins the uncouth folly of depreciating advantages which we must forego or denying reverses which we have to sustain. To say systematically "Yes" to the evils of life would not only break the fruitful continuity of similarity and sympathy, but mar the individual's energy, and jumble the individual's instincts. It would be a poor beginning

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for a Super-Man to start with sensibilities so complacent, or illusions so complete, that other men's poison should become his natural meat; and it would condemn him, in the long run, to receive of the life he thus stupidly accepted only the poisonous refuse. 'Tis a poor result of moralizing to affirm that black is white, loss no loss, suffering no suffering; one feels it in all Stoicism from Epictetus down to Maeterlinck, and in all religious mysticism which insists on the goodness of a humanly good God. And if, following Nietzsche's example, we lay ruthlessly analytic hands upon the latest expression of this venerable and indisputable piece of conventional morality, we shall find in the Zarathustrian precept, of "not merely enduring, but loving the inevitable," something worse than the mere weakness and insincerity which is at the bottom of all the other embodiments of this particular "vital lie." For, as the really difficult attitude towards life would be the simple, straightforward one of seeing it lucidly and feeling normally towards it, of hating its evil in proportion as we cherish its good, of continuing in our consciousness the great work of selection with a resolute "No" as well as a resolute "Yes"; as this would evidently be the attitude requiring perhaps almost superhuman strength and displaying almost superhuman dignity, there comes to be an element of positive vulgarity in the swagger of Zarathustra, shouting his "Yes" to the eternally recurring cycle of the universe's intolerable evils. Nay, worse than this; is there not in these Zarathustrian antics of "laughter and dancing" in the face of the most desolating of all nightmare conceptions of the universe, and in this ugly misapplication of the high and happy word "love" to the object of hatred, is there not in all this famous "Yes," a virtual "No" to everything natural, sane in spirit, nay, healthy in body?

Can this be the great gift for which Nietzsche is evermore preparing us? Is it in favor of this that we are told to destroy all long-established systems and valuations? for this that we are to purify the world and our souls by ruthlessness, by "deliberate cruelty" towards others and ourselves? for this that the hills are to be levelled and the valleys raised up by methods of earthquake rather than of engineering? Not in reality. For, more than in any other philosopher, we become aware that there is in Nietzsche's mind something round which his system has grown, but which is far more essential and vital to him than his system: something

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continually alluded to, constantly immanent, round which he perpetually hovers, into which he frequently plunges, on whose bank he erects metaphysical edifices, lets off fireworks of epigrams, sets holocausts ablaze and sings magnificent dithyrambs; but which remains undefined, a vague *It*. Such an ineffable central mystery exists in the thought of many philosophers, and perhaps of all mystics (for Nietzsche is a mystic); a whirlpool explaining everything, but never itself explained; called, as the case may be, "Higher Law," "Truth," "Good," sometimes merely "Nature," and, in the remoter Past, most frequently called by the name of "God." It is one of Nietzsche's finest and profoundest achievements that he has, once or twice, called this transcending *It* by a new, surprising and, methinks, a correct name, "My Taste."

In Nietzsche's case, indeed, more perhaps than in that of any other philosopher, the living nucleus of all his teaching is not a thought, but an emotional condition, organic and permanent. Under all the arguments which have grown out of it, under all the facts and theories attracted to it like iron filings to a magnet, out of the refuse of old and the mess of new doctrines, there is, if we look carefully enough, a chronic irritation and throbbing: "I dislike," "I hate," "I am made uncomfortable," "I am incompatible," "I want to get rid," "I want to destroy," "I want to be alone," "I want room for my soreness and swelling." The hypertrophied, hypersensitive ego, which cannot endure the contact of life, the presence of others and other things; the sick ego, in its feverish shiftings and feverish all-overishness, capable of convulsive efforts passing the powers of health, incapable at the same time of the most normal and every-day endurance; such is, I think, the living core of Nietzsche's doctrines. And the various transcending messages he feels that he must bring, the great efforts of destruction and reconstruction he must accomplish, are merely the delusive birth-throes, they are the massive, yet pervading, pain of a soul which distorts and magnifies all things to the measure of its discomfort. We have seen how his "Will to Power," remaining consciously such, fails to metamorphose itself into those desires for the not-ego, into that striving after the external-to-oneself, into that thinking and feeling of the outside world, which is the process of exteriorization of the subject into the object, normal and necessary in every healthy soul. We have seen similarly how, despite his extraordinary genius, the vastness

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the universe and its complexity and vigor of life entirely escaped Nietzsche, until the world shrank to being little more for him than an inert, almost counterfeit, stage filled up by his own imaginary size and strength; the cooperation of every kind of existence, the give and take of past and present, the ceaseless act of assimilation and reproduction, and their culmination in the immortally living human work, all this accessory, organic, endless and endless complex activity becoming replaced in his mind, by the puny deed of volition of a mere individual Über-Mensch. Nay, we have seen how he gravely asserted that this microscopic human detail could actually accept with a pompous "Yes" the inevitable course of life universal, of which he, his thought and volition, are but as the minutest bubble of froth; and we have seen also how this supposed "'Yes' to life" is in reality, and more than in any of the old ascetic doctrines, a "No" to the most strongly organized preferences and repulsions of the normal soul.

For Nietzsche, through the purely intellectual and often inherited parts of whose work we can trace the thread of that autobiographical philosophy he so greatly prized, gave with unerring truth the formula of his temperament. "A pleasure in saying 'No,' a certain deliberate ruthlessness." The "No," a "No" of his whole unhappy organism, exists not merely in this element of destructiveness; but even more subtly and characteristically in that sense of almost bodily disgust *(Ekel)* which the contact of his fellow men, of their thoughts and feelings, arouses in him, with significant metaphors of "lack of air" and "filthy smell." Even more than that titillation of tearing and breaking perpetually in Nietzsche's fingers, there is the unmistakable evidence of disease in this constant spiritual nausea in Nietzsche's mouth. The two together mean that this man, so splendidly endowed in intellect, was so unhappily constituted as to receive mainly painful impressions from the totality of his surroundings. I think I am justified in saying "mainly painful impressions," despite the occasional praise which Nietzsche bestows upon classic literature, remote Alpine fastnesses, southern clearness and radiance, and more particularly upon certain music — Bizet's, especially, and (partly from contradictoriness to the Wagnerians) Mozart's. For such evidences of pleasure from outer things are not only rare, but they are never fused into any kind of pervading mood of gladness, of appreciation and gratitude towards the outer world. He has, in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deed, put into words his incapacity of feeling anything save the fewest and most far-between impressions of the goodness of things, and expressed the mass of discontented, depreciating self-assertion in which these rare appreciative impressions were set. For such is the meaning, as indicative of Nietzsche's personality, of that famous phrase about the glance of the true philosopher, "which rarely admires, rarely looks up, rarely loves."

Let us think what that means; and, particularly, what is contained in that boast of rarely loving. And in this last item, especially, the secret of Nietzsche's nature is out. One guesses it many times, but perhaps nowhere in his works is it so strongly suggested, as in a certain beautiful chapter of "Zarathustra." He shows himself in it surrounded by all the beauty of life, all the tenderness of life, and by the majestic fact of life's eternal renovation; and he shows himself, at the same time, without the smallest thrill of emotional recognition, without the faintest sense of being a part of it, without the faintest longing to merge himself therein, to take it in, to give himself to it, without a trace of the universal instinct to assimilate, to be renovated, to add to it in one's turn. He shows himself separate, unmoved, impervious, unaltered, solitary, sterile. The reason why Nietzsche will always remain inferior to other thinkers, from Plato and Lucretius to Spinoza and Schopenhauer, is that, for all his talk of "loving the inevitable," the man has no experience of the fact of love. I do not speak of love of human beings. Not to know that is certainly a lack and limitation, but there are lacks and limitations far deeper and graver still than that: not to unite in thought and feeling with the thought and the feeling of which the world is full; not to appreciate, not to admire, not to reverence; not to unite in joy with what is lovely, in reverence with what, in this universe, is mysterious; nay, not to unite in the fruitful struggle of hatred with what is hateful.

But Nietzsche's Super-Man was to say "Yes" to the whole of life, to "love the inevitable"—that is to say, as he himself explained, that which most human beings could scarcely endure; he was to love rarely; or more correctly speaking—for those who have the power of loving must needs love whenever there is occasion, and the occasion is not rare, but common—he was not to love, in the word's real sense, at all.

Haunted, hag-ridden, by the sense of his own sore and strug-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gling ego, Nietzsche, true to the autobiographical instincts which he discovered in all philosophic systematizing, made life synonymous with that ego's realization and assertion. "Give," he wrote in one of his latest and finest works, "Give me, ye heavenly ones, give me madness! madness to make me believe at last in myself." But in this world of intuitive and imitative action, of reflex-like instincts implanted inextricably deep below consciousness, there is no need for special self-belief or self-assertion; or, rather, self-belief and self-assertion are bound to exist, to push, to act, to speak, everywhere and in everything, whether they be conscious or not. The realization of one's own ego is—even when it is not the fly's self-realization on the coach-wheel—the most unnecessary epi-phenomenon; nay, the least fruitful exercise of an idle dilettanteism. Believe in oneself! Why is it not enough that we believe in the objects of our love and our hate, in the aims of our impulses and actions? And does life depend upon the fiat of individual self-realization? What is this childish trifling about saying "'Yes' to life," about loving the inevitable? Man, the inevitable can do without your approval! And Life has you safe in its clutches, Life, Death—and the madness you invoked, also.

Why have we spent so much time—which would have sufficed to collect a volume of sane and useful sayings out of Nietzsche's work—upon the analysis of his unhappy, morbid and sterile personality? Partly because, in the universal and necessary reconsideration of all our previous habits of belief and standards of conduct, the imitation of Nietzsche's attitude constitutes a real, though a momentary, danger to some of us. But partly, also, because the attitude of Nietzsche suggests in its main characteristics, and helps us to construct even in some of its details, an attitude towards the universe of an exactly contrary nature. In analyzing the sham "Yes" which this passionate No-Sayer flung in the face of the life he had stripped of all living quality, we may have been led to conceive a more genuine "Yes" addressed to a more real life. And thus we may have come to reverse the prayer of Nietzsche, and to exclaim, in humility and confidence: "Give us, ye Heavenly Ones, Sanity; so that we may believe in all which is not merely our own self."

VERNON LEE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PHILIPPINE PROBLEM FROM A FILIPINO STANDPOINT.

BY JUAN SUMULONG, MEMBER OF THE HONORARY BOARD OF FILIPINO COMMISSIONERS TO THE ST. LOUIS EXPOSITION, AND PROFESSOR IN THE MANILA LAW SCHOOL.

In treating of Philippine questions, it is of great importance to know at the outset whether the Filipinos are a political unit, capable of pursuing a common object and of attaining it; whether, in short, they constitute a true nationality, or whether, on the contrary, they are merely tribes, an accidental combination of elements, without mutual affinity and ready to damage or annihilate each other.

It is clear that, in speaking of the Filipino people, we refer especially to that predominant part which is composed of seven millions of Christian Filipinos, and make little account of the remaining six hundred thousand, whether they be Itas, Moros or Igorrotes, who belong to a separate category, and who, by reason of their insignificance in numbers, and their lack of European culture, bear a social and political relation to the Christian Filipinos similar to that which the North-American Indians bore to the people of the United States during the first fifty years of the history of that nation. These Christian Filipinos, that is to say, the Tagalogs, Visayans, Ilocanos, Bicols, Pangasinanos and Pampangos (to name only the principal groups), are from the same Malayan stock* that, in pre-Spanish times, came to populate the archipelago.

Although it may appear strange, the fact which has given the

* The word "Tagalog," by which is signified one of the most important nuclei of the Filipino population, is derived from "*taga-ilog*," the "dwellers upon the river," and this name was given to all of the early Malays that came to the islands, who before their immigration lived upon the banks of a Malayan river.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

greatest strength to the claim that the Filipinos are composed of tribes is also, without doubt, that which furnishes the best evidence that they form a homogeneous whole. Because the Filipinos speak various dialects, some people believe they do not constitute a nation. But one who makes a slight study of these dialects promptly sees they are no more than variations of a single original language, which has become modified for reasons that only a prolonged study of pre-Spanish Philippine history can explain. The slight mutual intercourse among the early Filipinos, living in islands and regions isolated from each other, gave rise to the differentiations that produced the dialects. But the physical characteristics that mark the Tagalogs, Visayans, Ilocanos, Bicols, etc., show at a glance their close relationship.

An appeal to history makes the point still clearer. The unifying effect of Christian civilization, the acts in which the Filipino people united in order vigorously to oppose the all-embracing influence of the Friars under the Spanish régime, and, later, the very war that was waged by all Filipinos against Spain and the United States for the sake of independence, are practical demonstrations of a real and definite unity. Notwithstanding that the settled policy of the Spanish domination, represented by the Friar influence, was to divide the Filipinos, and so govern more conveniently, it may be safely said that it would be difficult to find, in the last fifty years, a single Filipino who has felt himself a stranger or indifferent to the common interests; while, in general, all Filipinos have shared in the joys and woes that events have brought to their country. With such facts in view, only those with a warped judgment can fail to recognize that in the Philippines there is being developed a people whose political individuality must soon or late be recognized. An American, or a European, can from his point of view have doubts whether the Filipinos could to-day establish and sustain an independent government. But, if he knows Filipino history, if he is capable of giving a just value to the progress achieved by the Filipinos under a system of government in which everything tended to prevent their improvement and their advance, he will recognize much that was heroic in their efforts, and he will be inclined rather to meditate on what they might have become under happier auspices than to judge of them by undertakings never brought to a successful issue.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the present time, we find ourselves under the American sovereignty that has come to replace that of Spain. That American sovereignty has been accepted in the belief that it would give the Filipinos a chance to pursue their own development, to acquire experience for themselves, and to face the responsibilities that history rightfully places upon those peoples who hold their destinies in their own hands. The Filipinos wish to make a trial on their own account. They wish to learn the art of self-government by practising it, for that is the only way to know its secrets. Are there difficulties in the path, and even dangers? Then it is worthy of our effort to meet these difficulties and dangers—if they exist—and vanquish them. Until the country sees her own children as the predominating element in her government, the most important step under American sovereignty in the Philippines will not have been taken. We know, from what we hear and what we read, that not a few Americans insist that the control of the government and its administration shall remain in the hands of American functionaries; while others, not content with appropriating the lion's share, throw upon the whole Filipino race the shadow of distrust, and with injurious intent openly declare, or covertly insinuate, that it is incapable of understanding and organizing a republican system of government. When we learn of such things, we infer that there is in some Americans a prejudice that does not permit them to render full justice to other peoples.

With respect to those who desire the United States to have a hold practically absolute over the government of the islands, we have to say that they misconceive the Philippine question and do not correctly trace its lines. The Filipino people has received under Spain not an Oriental but a European education, which has brought into being a body of men capable of directing the government of the country. It has often been said that the great majority of the population lack not only political experience, but even the most elementary education. But this last is not a correct statement, for, apart from Spanish, the Filipinos who cannot at least read and write their own dialect* are few and rare indeed. As for political experience, it is

* A similar condition is to be noted in a great part of the Japanese nation. Yet, nevertheless, no one would have the right to say that the Japanese, who know only their own dialect, are wholly ignorant.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not strange that the people in large part should be without it, simply because they have always been without the opportunity of acquiring it. This, however, furnishes only one reason the more for not withholding for any further period the exercise of political rights from a people that has shed its blood to obtain them. When a people rises as one man and fights for a thing, it must be that the people not only knows what it is fighting for, but that it recognizes to the full the value of the prize.

Little need be said about the educational progress made by the Filipinos, or the advance they have made, under the existing government, in their participation in the work of the judiciary and other branches of administration; for it is presumed the American public is already informed of the interest that a Filipino family takes in sending its children to public schools, and of the efficiency, loyalty and devotion to duty with which Filipino officials have performed that part of the general task which fell to them. Let us, therefore, consider the question dispassionately, on the supposition that the object of the presence of the United States in the Philippines is to aid the Filipinos to establish a free government of their own. Now, it is evident that it is not a question of forming a nation *de novo*, but rather of carrying through a work complementary to that which has been already done, and this does not necessitate on the part of the United States a retention of supreme control over the islands. All Filipinos, it would appear, wish, so far as suitable and practicable, to adopt in the Philippines the excellent system of government that has been found to work so well in the United States. But the very labor of selection and adaptation can better be done by Filipinos, who can be supposed to see more clearly what is suitable to the conditions of the country, and therefore what is desirable, and can be trusted to work more conscientiously. It is true that the Filipinos, in beginning this difficult work, will need the aid of the Americans, because in such cases the counsels of experience have a priceless value. It is true, also, that the Filipinos, following the example of Japan, wish to extend widely in their country the knowledge of the English tongue, although not for the sake of becoming more civilized, but rather because English is the indispensable vehicle of communication with the most advanced portion of the human race. But, granting that everything goes to show that the help of the Americans

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the government and in educational work would be useful, almost, indeed, indispensable for a certain period, it is wholly unnecessary to conclude for that reason that the Filipinos must be deprived of the responsibility of their own government.

It is neither impatience, nor yet the ambition to become the chief figures in the government, that impels the Filipinos to call urgently for the establishment of self-government. It is only the desire to simplify difficulties, which are each day becoming greater and more to be feared. The unsettled political condition of the islands encourages many wholly unscrupulous American residents of the Philippines constantly to urge that the United States should treat the Filipinos as Great Britain treats her Crown Colonies. Such an attitude naturally serves to inspire distrust in the breast of the Filipino. Would it not be salutary, therefore, and would it not have a good effect on this class of Americans, a most numerous body, if the tangible evidence of *deeds* should be afforded that the final object of the American occupation is to give to the Filipinos a government *by Filipinos?* Although the conduct of many American officials gives an exalted idea of their mission in the Philippines, unfortunately the same cannot be said of them all. Thus these circumstances unite to show why the American Government receives no great support among the masses, for they retain a lively recollection of the shifty ways of the Spanish régime.

Often it is asked why the Filipinos do not insist upon their personal rights, as guaranteed them by the organic law of the Philippines, and why they allow abuses to flourish, or a punishable offence to go unpunished. Some have attributed this phenomenon to a lack of acquaintance with the rights conferred upon them by that act. Now, it is not possible that a person who is the object of an injury should be ignorant that he has a legal remedy. The real trouble in the Philippines is that, justly or unjustly, there is a lack of faith in the possibility of obtaining it. Other phenomena of the same description might be cited. Only when in the government of the islands the native element shall have its proper representation will confidence be restored, and the working of such a government will be more efficient and will better subserve the good of the country. Not only, then, do considerations of justice, but also considerations of political expediency, counsel the establishment of a truly representative gov-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernment, as the sole means of bringing about a normal situation in the public affairs of the Philippines.

In intimate connection with the modification of the provisional government of the Philippines should be the definition of the future relations between the islands and the United States; that is to say, whether there shall be annexation, a protectorate or absolute independence. It is not the purpose of these lines to resolve these questions by considering the movements of American purposes and opinions. To discuss *a posteriori* whether the United States acquired their sovereignty over the Philippines legitimately, or illegitimately, would be no less indiscreet. The Filipinos are more anxious in regard to the present and future conduct of the United States in the Philippines, and, if that is good and beneficial to the country, the question of the past should be a secondary consideration.

But what is the attitude of the Filipino people, or at least of a majority of the Filipino people, upon the question of its own future? It would require a careful investigation to discover the true opinion of the country. With the exception of the Federal Party, there exists to-day no organized political groups with their ideas concretely expressed in their platforms, and thus the difficulty of investigation is greatly augmented.

Even the Federal Party is to-day in a period of critical evolution—perhaps of radical and important transformation.*

At the beginning, the Federal Party was partly composed of those who had taken part in the revolution, but who were then sincerely in favor of peace, of the adoption of a government upon the American plan, and of a process of evolution in order to bring this all happily about. Others came into the party when they became convinced of the intention of the United States to retain the islands, and they cherished for a time the hope of forming a part of the American Union, believing in good faith that, having lost the hope of independence, the best opportunity for the Filipinos was to enjoy the same rights as are enjoyed by the citizens of the Republic that had come to assume sovereignty over the country. Many others, and these formed the majority, when they saw that the war was both use-

* At the present time, the Federal Party is in process of reorganization upon a new declaration of principles and a new platform, and it can be asserted with confidence that, whatever other results are reached, the idea of annexation or federation will not be countenanced.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less and prejudicial, and that to compel the United States to grant independence was not feasible, proposed to themselves first of all to work with the Federal Party for the pacification of the country, but without abandoning the idea of attaining independence later on, by peaceable means and by appealing to the sense of justice of the American people.

Thus, as is seen, in treating of the only organized political party in the Philippines, it is easy to fall into error, unless the necessary knowledge is had of the men fighting in its ranks and of the events that led to its formation. As for the rest of the people that do not belong to the Federal Party, they are frankly in favor of independence in short order, and do not care for the process of evolution that is the characteristic idea of the misnamed Federalists. Nevertheless, it would be a great mistake to believe that the Nationalists cling to-day, with the same rigidity as during the war and the years immediately following it, to the doctrine of independence immediate, complete and absolute. The growing rivalries between the conquering Powers resulting in an aggressive policy in the Far East, the experience that Korea is actually undergoing, finding herself, against her will, enveloped in a bloody war, have opened the eyes of the irreconcilable Filipinos and have brought them to the belief that of equal importance with the obtaining independence itself is the securing of a guarantee that that independence shall not be a thing precarious, at the mercy of the ambitions of the strong.

There are still two other political groups in the Philippines, namely, the Liberals and the Democrats. But it can be affirmed that the reason for their existence is not very clear, for the Liberals have aims similar to those of the Federal Evolutionists, and the Democrats are almost as pronounced advocates of nationalism as the Nationalists themselves. The so-called Labor Party forms a group apart, and, although its organization is not active in general politics, it sympathizes with the Nationalists and Radicals.

It results, then, that in reality there exist only two great parties in the Philippines; on the one hand are the Federalists, who should be called the Evolutionists; and, on the other, are those of every political complexion who favor speedy independence. Taking, then, into consideration only those points in which both sides agree, the following can be accepted as representing the aspirations of a great majority of the people:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1. The immediate establishment of a government for Filipinos by Filipinos, with the aid of the Americans;*

2. The future independence of the country—as soon as practicable, according to the idea of the Nationalists; after a period of evolution, according to the Evolutionists;

3. A Protectorate by the United States over the Philippine Republic, or, if that is not realizable, an international guarantee, obtained with the aid and influence of the Government of the United States, securing the inviolability of Philippine independence.

The perspicacity of that noted American statesman, Mr. Root, ex-Secretary of War, as well as the profound knowledge of the aspirations of the Filipinos that he acquired during the time when he was ably filling his elevated position, enabled him, in his address before the Republican Convention in Chicago, to trace in broad lines the policy that appears at once to be the most satisfactory to the Filipinos and, at the same time, the most just, and hence the most worthy of the great American people. The eloquent words in which Mr. Root substantially echoes the true aspirations of the Philippine people will have a most beneficial effect on public tranquillity in the Philippines, and will powerfully aid in promoting a good understanding between Americans and Filipinos. I desire to conclude by reproducing the wise recommendations of Mr. Root in respect to American policy in the Philippines:

"None can foretell the future; but there seems no reasonable cause to doubt that, under the policy already effectively inaugurated, the institutions already implanted, and the processes already begun, in the Philippine Islands, if these be not repressed and interrupted, the Philippine people will follow in the footsteps of the people of Cuba; that more slowly, indeed, because they are not as advanced, yet as surely, they will grow in capacity for self-government, and, receiving power as they grow in capacity, will come to bear substantially such relations to the people of the United States as do now the people of Cuba, differing in details as conditions and needs differ, but the same in principle and the same in beneficial results."

JUAN SUMULONG.

* See the speech of acceptance by President Roosevelt, July 27th, 1904.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW AMERICAN MUSIC.

BY LAWRENCE GILMAN.

THE young American composer of unrecognized ability occupies a position as discouraging as it is anomalous. Whereas the young painter of marked talent, the young writer of parts, the gifted young sculptor, find a constant invitation to prove their capacities, the composer of serious and admirable purpose encounters, on the contrary, a curiously persistent discouragement. If he writes for orchestra, where, among our foreign-born conductors, will he find one who is disposed to examine his tone-poem or his symphony with a view to discovering and exhibiting a new talent in contemporary music? What publisher will give a moment's consideration to his songs or piano works, if they are not cut after the most definitely appealing patterns? And we all know what prospect of consideration or production there is for an American opera under present conditions. One has only to state these facts, in the barest possible terms, to compel a recognition of them from any one familiar with the conditions of musical art in America. Not to put too fine a point upon it, the American composer of serious artistic purpose who has not already, or by extraneous means, acquired reputation of a commanding sort, has little or no opportunity of gaining a hearing for his work, or any recognition of its possible availability, through what one may call the recognized channels of musical publicity.

If this is true of the young composer whose ideals, although admirable, offer no impediment to their general acceptance by musicians and music-lovers of the better class, it will easily be seen how hopeless has been the case of the composer who does not choose to be bound by traditional formulas, but who prefers, like De Musset, to "drink out of his own glass."

I have used the past tense in speaking of the hopelessness of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such a case; for, in spite of the blighting indifference of which the conditions I have denoted are significant, it has very recently been made evident that those progressive and independent spirits who choose to declare in music the issue of an individual vision and inspiration are becoming an artistic force of irresistible potency; and for those of us who would modify a certain remarkable prophecy of Mr. George Meredith's so that it should accord with a conviction that the American genius will find its most influential expression in music, rather than in that art of which Mr. Meredith himself is so consummate a master, the immediate past has yielded a very definite surety and confirmation.

One of the younger group of contemporary American composers, Mr. Arthur Farwell,—a pupil of Humperdinck and a writer of expansive and poetic imagination,—realizing the authentic beauty and importance of the music which some of our less eminent native writers are producing, recently established at Newton Center, Massachusetts, a press which is devoted wholly to the publication of the best of this new music that he can procure,—considering it solely upon its artistic merits, and entirely aside from the question of a profitable popularity. It is an admirable enterprise—beyond question, as has elsewhere been said, the most determined, enlightened and altruistic endeavor to advance the highest interests of American music that has yet been made.

And how, one may reasonably ask, is the enterprise justifying itself? The answer is to be found in the best of the music which has so far been issued—music so untrammelled in its inspiration, so heedful and competent in its artistry, and of so challenging an independence in its construction and intent, that one would be venturesome who should assume to set bounds upon the possibilities of the creative power which, in the aggregate, achieved it.

Let any one who doubts the presence of an original and vital impulse in our native music consider some of Mr. Farwell's most significant publications. Turn, for example, to Mr. Henry F. Gilbert's "Two Verlaine Moods," a brace of poetic paraphrases for piano. Mr. Gilbert is, like his fellow musician, a resolute independent in his ideas and practices. His imagination is most readily kindled by the modern or the esoteric in poetry and thought; so that one finds him resorting continually, for subject-matter and inspiration, to such masters of the present as Maeterlinck, Flaubert, Verlaine. In the "Two Verlaine Moods," one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

notes immediately the authentic quality and color of the French lyrist; but here, too, is a dexterous and fluent art, an art distinguished and vivid, forceful and subtly articulated. A more recent work of Mr. Gilbert's is his paraphrase, for piano, of Poe's fantasy in prose, "The Island of the Fay." Mr. Gilbert has found a congenial and grateful theme for musical exposition in the poet's conception of a magical episode of haunted forest depths and mysterious faery presences. He has reflected precisely the mood of dream and remote enchantment conveyed by the words, and has composed a tone-paraphrase of memorable beauty and vividness. There are many passages of rare imaginative force, and the writing has an evident distinction.

Mr. Farwell's "Domain of Hurakan," a study in elemental symbolism, is an equally remarkable piece of writing in a wholly different kind. It is a fantasy conceived in the spirit of the Indian creation-myths, a finely vigorous and notable achievement. There are few more masterly passages in any music of American composition than the superb climax with which the work ends, and the insinuatingly lovely episode in B-major, with its eloquent intimation of nocturnal moods. A setting of a poem by William Blake also lingers in the memory (although here, for a moment, one is reminded that Wagner lived and wrote), together with a hauntingly poetic impression, for oboe and piano, inspired by Mr. Arthur Davies's painting, "Morfydd": a girl seated upon a bank of moss in a deep wood, dreamily plaiting her hair, while a youth beside her plays upon a harp. Then there is Mr. Farwell's piano piece, "Toward the Dream," an expression in free and ample form of the idea of aspiration and noble striving. In its poetic substance the music recalls Schumann's "*Aufschwung*," though Mr. Farwell has things of quite a different kind to say. A piano piece by Mr. Edward Burlingame Hill, "At the Grave of a Hero," is profound and true in feeling and impressive in utterance. And one must recall with a very keen pleasure Mr. Harvey Worthington Loomis's felicitous arrangement of two Verlaine poems, "On the Terrace" and "In the Moon Shower,"—the last contrived, curiously but with exquisite effect, as a spoken recitation, with obligato of piano, violin and voice; a movement from a piano sonata by Mr. Farwell; Mr. Gilbert's ardent and colorful scene for dramatic soprano, "Salammbô's Invocation to Tänith" (the text from the novel of Flaubert); and his poignant setting of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Lament of Deirdré from Ferguson's "The Death of the Children of Usnach": music saturated with the sense of that "heart-break over fallen things," that wildness of passionate revolt, that tragic and piercing melancholy, which are Celtic—and overwhelming.

What, it may be asked, is the essential nature, the purport, of this vivid new impulse in our native musical art? One would not be too impetuous in definition who should assert that it is, in essence, a force making most directly for *liberation:* for a broader range of content and an expansion of the expressional vehicle. That, beyond doubt, is its unique and most admirable characteristic. We are to learn that the whole of life and experience, in their emotional substance, is to be regarded as fit subject-matter for the musical artist who shall bring to them the requisite power of clairvoyant intuition and selective intelligence. These ardent young innovators have definitely pointed the way; they have laid under contribution a territory as illimitable as it is rewarding. Human experience, distilled in the substance of poetry, of drama, of painting; the manifold aspects and contours of the natural world, even the subtler intimations of spiritual consciousness, are, they teach us, susceptible of the most luminous musical manifestation. They have found their inspiration in regions widely various and apart, yet all of valid import and significance.

This of the content and substance of their work; of the form in which they have cast it, of the expressional means they have chosen to employ, one may say that it, also, is the signal of a new and vivifying principle. Here, too, the movement is clearly in the way of liberation, of an extension and enlargement of the expressional medium—these, as Fiona Macleod has but lately written of certain of the modern Celtic poets, are "artists curiously persuading art." The utmost freedom is exercised in the conception, articulation and embodiment of the musical idea. The traditional restrictions in the matter of key-relationships, harmonic consistency and melodic structure, of which music has been growing more and more intolerant since Wagner pointed the way to complete emancipation, are here unhesitatingly cast aside,—with, in some instances, an even more persistently adventurous spirit than is exemplified in the brilliant audacities of Richard Strauss. The governing aim is to achieve the quintessence of expressional

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power, the precise embodiment and equivalent, at every point, of the particular thought and emotional intention of the subject which has been chosen for representation.

The quality of the musical style which is, in varying manner, the product of this principle of uncompromising flexibility does not by any means, as yet, signify the existence of a distinctive "American" school. Nor is it desirable that it should. We hear much talk of the need of such a national school, whereby we may offset an assumed "German," or "French," or "Russian" school. But when will it be recognized that there are no such schools, in any important sense of the term? There is the art of Richard Strauss and the art of Mahler, or Weingartner, or Humperdinck—all Germans, yet separate and individual in the artistic implications of their several styles; and in France there is the art of Claude Debussy, which is quite irreconcilable with the art of Vincent d'Indy; and, looking to Russia, is one to find a common artistic denominator for the Rimsky-Korsakoff of "Mlada" and the Rachmaninoff of "The Cliff"? So, among this group of young American music-makers, there are separate and resolute individualities, associated though they may be, and characterized by an allegiance to certain informing tenets and convictions.

Let there be no misconception in the matter: this music professes, through its appreciators, no virtue merely for being of American origin: they are not of those who, in the caustic phrase of Mr. Philip Hale, would "cover mediocrity with a cloak of patriotism." The music which Mr. Farwell presents to our attention is, as it happens, American, and it is abundantly characteristic; but, first and above all, it is excellent and moving art.

LAWRENCE GILMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRESENT STATUS OF REPUDIATED STATE BONDS.

BY MARK SULLIVAN.

At the present moment there is pending in the United States Supreme Court at Washington a judgment in a suit so interesting in itself, so picturesque in its historic background, so vital in its bearing upon some hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of State bonds now regarded as practically worthless, that it merits careful examination. The judgment is for $27,400; it is in favor of the State of South Dakota and against the State of North Carolina. The decree is that North Carolina must pay this amount, together with costs of suit, "on or before the first Monday of January, 1905"; and it is provided that, if North Carolina does not pay, certain property belonging to that State shall be seized, advertised and sold at public auction, "such sale to be made at the east front door of the Capitol-building in Washington."

The history of this remarkable case can best be followed, and the *pros* and *cons* which caused the Supreme Court to split into sides of four and five in handing down their decision can best be understood, through a chronological statement of the incidents which led up to the suit. The first step consisted in the sending of the following letter, on September 10th, 1901, from a broker in New York to the Honorable Charles Burke, a Member of Congress from the State of South Dakota:

"The undersigned, one of the members of the firm of ———, has decided, after consultation with the other holders of the second-mortgage bonds issued by the State of North Carolina, to donate ten of these bonds to the State of South Dakota.

"The holders of these bonds have waited for some thirty years in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hope that the State of North Carolina would realize the justice of their claims for the payment of these bonds.

"The bonds are all now about due, besides, of course, the coupons, which amount to some 170 per cent. of the face of the bond.

"The holders of these bonds have been advised that they cannot maintain a suit against the State of North Carolina on these bonds, but that such a suit can be maintained by a foreign state or by one of the United States.

"The owners of these bonds are mostly, if not entirely, persons who liberally give charity to the needy, the deserving, and the unfortunate.

"These bonds can be used to great advantage by States or foreign governments, and the majority owners would prefer to use them in this way rather than take the trifle which is offered by the debtor.

"If your State should succeed in collecting these bonds, it would be the inclination of the owners of a majority of the total issue now outstanding to make additional donations to such governments as may be able to collect from the repudiating State, rather than accept the small pittance offered in settlement.

"The donors of these ten bonds would be pleased if the Legislature of South Dakota should apply the proceeds of these bonds to the State University or to some of its asylums or other charities."

Lawyers, and persons familiar with the story of that curious and widely discussed incident of American history known as "Repudiation," may understand this letter fully. For others, some explanation is necessary.

To make this explanation clear the most important fact is this: A State Government cannot be sued by an individual. When this broker says in his letter that "the holders of these bonds have been advised that they cannot maintain suit against the State of North Carolina on these bonds, but that such a suit can be maintained by . . . one of the United States," he has reference to two provisions in the United States Constitution. If an individual has a claim against a State, he is utterly without redress so far as the Court is concerned; but, if one State has a claim against another State, it can bring suit in the United States Court. This state of the law makes it possible for any commonwealth to evade its debts whenever it is so minded, leaving the creditor without redress. At various times, eleven of the Southern States, North Carolina among the number, have taken advantage of this situation to repudiate their bonded debts to the extent of some hundreds of millions of dollars. The generous donor who signed the letter quoted above found himself in possession of a large number of bonds of the State of North Caro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lina which that State refused to pay, and which he had no way of compelling the State to pay, and which were practically valueless. But it occurred to this broker, or it occurred to his lawyer, that if some State Government owned these bonds they could be collected; hence the gift. To the broker, the bonds were worth nothing; to South Dakota, they would be worth their full face value.

It may readily be imagined that South Dakota received this gift with some surprise; but the State Legislature passed an act entitled, "An Act to Require the Acceptance and Collection of Grants, Devises, Bequests, Donations, and Assignments to the State of South Dakota." Inasmuch as this act will be examined with some scrutiny later on, it is here quoted in full:

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of South Dakota:

"Section 1. That whenever any grant, devise, bequest, donation, or gift or assignment of money, bonds, or choses in action, or of any property, real or personal, shall be made to this State, the Governor is hereby directed to receive and accept the same, so that the right and title to the same shall pass to this State; and all such bonds, notes, or choses in action, or the proceeds thereof when collected, and all other property or thing of value, so received by the State as aforesaid, shall be reported by the Governor to the Legislature, to the end that the same may be covered into the public treasury or appropriated to the State University or to the public schools, or to State charities, as may hereafter be directed by law.

"Section 2. Whenever it shall be necessary to protect or assert the right or title of the State to any property so received or derived as aforesaid, or to collect or to reduce into possession any bond, note, bill, or chose in action, the Attorney-General is directed to take the necessary and proper proceedings, and to bring suit in the name of the State in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal, and to prosecute all such suits, and is authorized to employ counsel to be associated with him in such suits or actions, who, with him, shall fully represent the State, and shall be entitled to reasonable compensation out of the recoveries and collections in such suits and actions."

Armed with this statute, South Dakota accepted the bonds, and the Attorney-General of the State, after engaging the assistance of eminent counsel, prepared for suit. North Carolina defended, and argument was heard before the full bench of the Supreme Court at Washington for three days during April, 1903. Further argument was heard in November, 1903; and again, in January of the present year, the Supreme Court gave three

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more days to the hearing of still further argument on the involved points of the case. Thereafter, the Court kept the case under advisement for several weeks; and, finally, some months ago, the decision quoted above, in favor of South Dakota, was handed down by Mr. Justice Brewer, with whom four of his fellow Justices agreed. The remaining four Justices handed down an unusually complete and forcible opinion of dissent. Decidedly, there are two sides to this case.

Before considering, in detail, the reasons for the opinion, and the reasons for the dissent, and before considering in which direction the best public policy points, it will be well briefly to review the history of repudiation.

During the early forties, one of the Southern States, filled with the railroad-building fever which then prevailed, applied to Baring Brothers, of London, for a loan. That firm, in considering the matter, discovered the provision of the United States Constitution which has been pointed out, and which would put them entirely at the mercy of the State's sense of moral obligation. To get further advice in the matter, they consulted Daniel Webster, then in the prime of his fame as a constitutional lawyer, and the most eminent American statesman of the day. Webster acknowledged that Baring Brothers' inference as to the law in the case was correct, but he went on to say that the loan was, nevertheless, a perfectly safe one. He wrote:

"The States cannot rid themselves of their obligations otherwise than by the payment of their debts. . . . They cannot get round the duty nor evade its source. Any failure to fulfil its obligations would be an open violation of public faith, to be followed by the penalty of dishonor and disgrace; a penalty, it may be presumed, which no State of the American Union would be likely to incur. . . . I believe that the citizens of the United States, like all honest men, regard debts, whether public or private, and whether existing at home or abroad, to be of moral as well as of legal obligation. If it were possible that any one of the States should, at any time, so entirely lose its self-respect and forget its duty as to violate the faith solemnly pledged for its pecuniary engagements, I believe there is no country upon earth—not even that of the injured creditor—in which such a proceeding would meet with less countenance or indulgence than it would receive from the great mass of the American people."

Whether Baring Brothers made the requested loan, and whether this particular State ever paid it back, I do not know; but it is a matter of history that, within ten years after Webster's elo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quent assurance of the moral grandeur of the American States, the State of Mississippi borrowed, by the issue of bonds, seven million dollars from a European firm of bankers, who were then, as now, the most conspicuous family engaged in the business of loaning money to nations; and of this seven million dollars not one cent was paid back, either in principal or in interest. The Governor of the State declared, with the high-pitched fervor of virtuous indignation, that the banker had "in his veins the blood of Judas and of Shylock, and unites the qualities of both his countrymen. He has mortgages upon the silver-mines of Mexico and on the quicksilver-mines of Spain. He has advanced money to the Sublime Porte, and taken as security a mortgage upon the Holy City of Jerusalem and the sepulchre of our Saviour. It is for our people to say whether he shall have a mortgage upon our cotton-fields and make serfs of our children." And the State of Mississippi rose up in its mighty sovereignty and declared that it would never pay an honest debt to one so shameless.

Within thirty years, ten other Southern States followed Mississippi's example; borrowed some scores of millions of dollars; spent the money in public improvements—and then wiped the debt off their books by the simple expedient of refusing to pay.

It is not possible to state accurately just how many millions there are of these unpaid bonds outstanding. When the States repudiated them, they ceased to carry them on their books. Twenty years ago, the amount charged against each State was estimated as follows:

Alabama	$38,812,000
Arkansas	20,807,000
Florida	5,280,000
Georgia	13,580,000
Louisiana	32,115,000
Mississippi	22,600,000
North Carolina	48,350,000
South Carolina	19,500,000
Tennessee	29,850,000
Total	$230,894,000

Since then, the twenty years' accumulation of interest would have doubled the sum total.

These repudiated bonds were held, and are still held, by scores of small investors throughout the Northern States and in Eng-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

land. They lie, with their big sheets of uncut coupons, in the dusty pigeonholes of desks. Occasionally, in settling up an estate, they come to light and are put upon the market. They command just about such a price as they are worth as historical curiosities. You can buy a gorgeously engraved and highly colored bond of the State of Louisiana, stamped with the State's seal and signed by the State officials, bearing the State's formal promise to pay $1,000, and interest which would now amount to over a thousand dollars more—you can buy this, or the bond of any of these repudiating States, for from five to fifteen dollars. It is ten of such bonds that figure in the present suit between South Dakota and North Carolina.

It is not to be supposed that the holders of these bonds viewed the arbitrary defiance of their legal rights with indifference. Some of the most scintillating gems in the whole literature of invective are to be found in the flood of angry protest and tart retort which passed between Northern investors and Southern repudiators. "Repudiation" was a term as familiar in the public prints of thirty years ago as "trusts" and "labor-unions" to-day. It was for the enrichment of literature that Sydney Smith, the noted English master of irony, had invested some of his savings in repudiated bonds and was, by his loss, stimulated to a strength and brilliancy of invective such as mere genius would never have inspired. He inveighed against "that total want of shame with which these things have been done; the callous immorality and deafness of the moral sense with which Europe has been plundered." He said:

> "If I were an American of any of the honest States, I would never rest till I had compelled the dishonest States to be as honest as myself. The bad faith of one State brings disgrace on all, just as the common snakes are killed because vipers are injurious. I have a feeling that by that breed of men I have been robbed and ruined, and I shudder and keep aloof. I am astonished that the honest States of America do not draw a *cordon sanitaire* around their unpaying brethren—that the truly mercantile New-Yorkers and the thoroughly honest people of Massachusetts do not, in their European visits, wear uniforms with 'S. S.' or 'Solvent States' worked in gold letters upon the coat."

It is worth noting that the State which had issued Mr. Smith's bonds, whether in response to the sting of his satire or not, afterward paid in full with interest.

The defrauded investors did not stop with mere words; they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

used every means which the richness of the stake caused ingenuity to suggest for persuading, bullying or coercing the Southern States into payment. But the repudiators were deaf to persuasion; and, when the force of the law was attempted, they smiled complacently behind their constitutional security.

Naturally, in the search for a remedy, the fact which has just been used in South Dakota's suit against North Carolina, the fact that, while an individual cannot sue, another State can sue, was soon noticed and dwelt upon. Ingenious lawyers sought for some means to take advantage of it. Finally, they hit upon a plan which offered some hope of success—a scheme which deserves a high place among the devious subterfuges of the law. The first step in it was to find a State willing to lend itself to the purposes of the bondholders. New Hampshire proved pliant; and the Legislature of that State passed a statute admirably adapted to serve the ends of those who wished to use the constitutional privileges of the commonwealth for their private ends. The statute, abbreviated and amended to show merely its general purport, read as follows:

"Whenever any citizen of this State shall be the owner of any claim against any of the other States . . . such citizen holding such claim may assign the same to the State of New Hampshire, and deposit the assignment thereof, . . . together with all the evidence necessary to substantiate such claim, with the Attorney-General of the State. Upon such deposit being made, it shall be the duty of the Attorney-General to examine such claim and the evidence thereof; and if, in his opinion, there is a valid claim which shall be just and equitable to enforce, . . . he, the Attorney-General, shall, upon the assignor of such claim depositing with him such sum as he, the said Attorney-General, shall deem necessary to cover the expenses and disbursements incident to, or which may become incident to, the collection of said claim, bring such . . . proceedings in the name of the State of New Hampshire, in the Supreme Court of the United States, as he, the said Attorney-General, shall deem necessary for the recovery of the money due upon such claim; and it shall be the duty of the said Attorney-General to prosecute such action or actions to final judgment for the collection of said claim, and to carry such judgment into effect, or, with the consent of the assignor, to compromise, adjust and settle such claim before or after judgment. Nothing in this act shall authorize the expenditure of any money belonging to this State, but the expenses of said proceedings shall be paid by the assignor of such claim; and the assignor of such claim may associate with the Attorney-General in the prosecution thereof, in the name of the State of New Hampshire, such other counsel as the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assignor may deem necessary, but the State shall not be liable for the fees of such counsel, or any part thereof. The Attorney-General shall keep all moneys collected upon such claim, or by reason of any compromise of any such claim, separate and apart from any other moneys of this State which may be in his hands, and shall deposit the same to his own credit, as special trustee under this act, in such bank or banks as he shall select; and the said Attorney-General shall pay to the assignor of such claims all such sums of money as may be recovered by him in compromise or settlement of such claims, deducting therefrom all expenses incurred by said Attorney-General."

It will be observed that the effect of this statute was to make the State a collecting-agent, to perform for certain individuals the work of collecting their overdue claims. As soon as this law was passed, some repudiated bonds were deposited, in the manner provided by the statute, with the Attorney-General of New Hampshire, and a test case was made up. Further evidence of the nature of the relation between New Hampshire and the individuals whose bonds the State was trying to collect is to be found in the following sentence from the agreement signed by the individuals, when, in accordance with the statute, they filed their bonds with the Attorney-General:

"And we do hereby covenant with the said State that, if an attempt is made by it to collect the said claim from the State of Louisiana, we will pay all the expenses of the collection of the same."

In due time, the case was heard before the Supreme Court. The decision was handed down by Chief-Justice Waite, and three brief sentences from his opinion will show what he thought of the elaborate subterfuge:

"The real question, therefore, is whether these holders of repudiated bonds can sue in the name of their respective States, after getting the consent of the State, or, to put it another way, whether a State can allow the use of its name in such a suit for the benefit of one of its citizens. . . . This State is nothing more nor less than a mere collecting agent of the owners of the bonds and coupons; and, while the suits are in the names of the States, they are under the actual control of individual citizens, and are prosecuted and carried on altogether by and for them. . . . Such being the case, we are satisfied that we are prohibited, both by the letter and the spirit of the Constitution, from entertaining these suits."

This happened just twenty years ago. With the collapse of this attempt, all effort to collect the repudiated bonds ceased,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

until the commencement of the present suit of South Dakota against North Carolina. In the light of this historical perspective, an examination of the merits of this present suit may show what decision on it would further the best public policy.

It is clear that this present suit was conceived in the same spirit as the one that failed in 1884. Chief-Justice Waite threw New Hampshire's case out of Court because the bonds were not the *bona fide* property of the State—New Hampshire was merely a trustee or agent. Obviously, the next step in this series of legal experiments upon the Supreme Court was to make some State a *bona fide* owner of the bonds. South Dakota was willing to step into New Hampshire's shoes, and the bonds were turned over to that commonwealth, with a letter which was made carefully explicit as to the completeness of the transfer.

This apparent completeness of the transfer is what caused Justice Brewer to give his decision in favor of South Dakota. On the face of it, the transfer was without reservation, and he declined to go behind the record to seek reasons which might have caused him to decide otherwise than as he did. He said:

> "It is true that the gift may be considered a rare and unexpected one. Apparently, the statute of South Dakota was passed in view of the expected gift, and probably the donor made the gift under a not unreasonable expectation that South Dakota would bring action against North Carolina to enforce these bonds, and that such action might inure to his benefit as the owner of other like bonds. But the motive with which a gift is made, whether good or bad, does not affect its validity or the question of jurisdiction."

Apparently, the Justice was strongly impressed by the necessity of explaining that he could not go behind the plain fact appearing upon the records, that South Dakota was the *bona fide* owner of the bonds. He quoted from another Justice of the Supreme Court this sentence: "If the law concerned itself with the motives of parties, new complications would be introduced into statutes which might seriously obscure their real merits." And, having conceded that South Dakota was the *bona fide* owner of the bonds, he felt compelled to give judgment in her favor.

The plain effect of that judgment, the law relating to repudiated bonds as it stands to-day, is this: Whenever by any sort of transfer which, so far as the records show, is *bona fide*, any State finds itself the owner of repudiated bonds whose conditions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are sufficiently analogous, in a legal sense, to the bonds in the present suit, that State can sue the repudiating State in the Supreme Court, and recover judgment. The perversion of public policy, the gross abuses, which may readily arise from this state of the law, can best be understood by a close examination of the statute by which South Dakota acquired the bonds in the present suit. For this purpose, it will be sufficient to quote five lines of the statute to which Mr. Justice White called emphatic attention in his strong dissenting opinion, in which he opposed permitting South Dakota to recover, italicizing the words which he italicized:

"The Attorney-General is authorized to employ counsel to be associated with him, in such suits or actions, who, with him, shall fully represent the State, and shall be entitled to reasonable compensation *out of the recoveries and collections in such suits and actions.*"

Now, what is the magic of these italicized words, which, alone, Justice White declares, make the suit one which the Court ought to refuse to lend its aid to. Their significance can best be illustrated by a supposititious case.

Suppose I buy ten thousand, or a hundred thousand, dollars of these bonds—as I may well be able to do, unless this present decision has raised their price—for one per cent. of their face value. Suppose I go to the proper official of South Dakota and say: "I am going to give you these bonds. I see by your statute that you are authorized to employ a lawyer to collect them. Now, I know a lawyer, A. He is my personal counsel. He is perfectly familiar with all the legal conditions of these bonds and is altogether the best man you can employ to collect them." It is only reasonable to suppose that the recipient of so bounteous a gift would be amiable enough to employ my friend A. And, without a doubt, as fees for lawyers go in the world of high finance, what the statute calls "a reasonable compensation" for the services of my friend, A., would be at least thirty per cent. of the face value of the bonds. And when A. has got his handsome fee, might not some generous impulse actuate him to come to me and thank me for having put him in the way of picking so rich a plum? Might he not even give me half the fee he got? The net result would then be this: I should have paid one per cent. for the bonds, and received fifteen per cent.; my friend A. would have fifteen per cent., and South Dakota would have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seventy per cent. Decidedly, there would be a general sense of peace and satisfaction in every quarter, except North Carolina.

Now, under the plain wording of this statute, and under the decision in the present case, every one of these things could happen to-morrow. The feeblest imagination can picture the avenues of financial and political corruption which this opens up.

Still another possibility follows this decision. Suppose that South Dakota had *bought* these bonds, instead of receiving them as a gift. The decision hangs entirely on the fact that South Dakota was the *bona fide* owner of the bonds. There is no magic in the fact that she got them as a gift; she would be equally the *bona fide* owner if she had bought them. This decision opens up endless opportunities for speculatively minded States to trade in the obligations of sister States. Can any imagination exaggerate the scandals, the corruption of Legislatures and State officials, the limitless possibilities of graft which would follow, if States should start to trade on the power which this decision gives them? Suppose some pocket-borough Legislature, completely dominated by one man whose personal say-so would secure the passage of any act—there have been such Legislatures in the largest and oldest States. Suppose this man should buy up these repudiated bonds at a cent or two on the dollar, then order his Legislature to buy them from him at fifteen, or twenty, or fifty cents on the dollar, and sue the repudiating States. This, too, is a possibility under the present decision. And there are other reasons of public policy why this precedent is unfortunate. They are too lengthy and too involved in legal technicality to be explained here; but the interested reader will find them set forth with strength and cogency in the dissenting opinion of Justices White, Fuller, McKenna and Day, which protests vigorously against—to use the language of Mr. Justice White—"endowing every State with the power of speculating upon stale and unenforceable claims of individuals against other States, thus not only doing injustice, but also overthrowing the fiscal independence of every State, and destroying that harmony between them which it was the avowed purpose of the Constitution to establish and cement."

Just here it should be explained, lest laymen misinterpret the scope of the present decision, that these repudiated bonds of the various States were issued for different purposes, with different

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conditions which affect, to a greater or less degree, their legal standing. The bonds sued on in the present case were each secured by a specific mortgage on certain stock of the railroad for the building of which they were issued. Speaking technically and legally, this decision is a binding precedent only for this particular issue of bonds and for such of the other bonds as have identical conditions. Bonds which vary will have to stand or fall in future suits according as they are more or less analogous to these bonds.

It may be inferred from what has been said that I do not think these bonds ought to be collected at all. This is far from the truth. What is to be protested against, and what the dissenting Justices disapprove, is this beating the Constitution about the stump, and sacrificing the dignity of sovereign States, to serve sordid ends. The Southern States ought to pay every cent of these repudiated bonds. It is possible that in due time these States will see this matter in the same light. But the day when they shall see it, and pay their repudiated obligations of their own free will, will not be hastened by making them the victims of legal jugglery with the Constitution. Other States have repudiated for a period, and later paid in full—notably Minnesota and Virginia. With the rapidly increasing prosperity of the Southern States, and the wealth they are speedily acquiring, these commonwealths may come to see that the wiping away of the moral stain of repudiation is well worth the vast sums which the act would require. Repudiation was utterly without justification; but it was not without such excuse as will appeal to charitable judgment. Those bonds which were issued during the forties and fifties fell due just after the War. The Southern States were not only impoverished; they were filled, as well, with resentment against the Northern classes who held the bonds, and who had, by the abolition of slavery, wiped away that very property which the South had relied upon to enable it to pay these bonds.

Few realize how enormous was the loss in property inflicted upon the Southern States by the War. Taking three States, the following figures show the fall in the value of taxable property:

	Taxable Value in 1860.	Taxable Value in 1870.	Percentage of Depreciation.
Mississippi	$509,472,912	$177,278,880	65
Alabama	432,198,762	155,582,595	64
North Carolina	292,297,602	130,378,190	55

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When the State debt was as high as could be carried in 1860, it is obvious that, with a decrease of over one-half the State wealth in 1870, it was simply impossible to continue to carry the debt. Repudiation was not only a temptation; temporarily, at least, it was a necessity.

And the carpet-bag governments, dominated by men who were not natives of the States, and who had no solicitude for their welfare, not only failed to nurse the wounded prosperity of the States and avoid further debt; they actually piled it higher, much higher than could be borne. This very State of North Carolina had in 1860 a State debt of only $9,699,600; by 1870, the carpet-bag government had increased it to $29,000,095.

Moreover, the questionable character of that portion of the debts which was added by the carpet-bag governments has been brought forward—and with much fairness—in extenuation of repudiation. Many, indeed the greater part, of all the repudiated bonds were issued by the reconstruction governments. The scandal and fraud connected with their issue furnished an excuse for repudiation later on, when the carpet-bag governments had left and the Southerners themselves again got control of the Legislatures. Says Mr. Clark Howell:

"For such bonded indebtedness as was fixed on the Southern States by those who overturned both human and divine law to obtain authority which did not exist, and who used the good name and credit of the Southern States by which to obtain money which they poured like water down the channels of their riotous and unceasing demand for pillage and plunder, I do not think that either equity, justice or law should require payment by the States which were so palpably robbed."

Robert P. Porter has thus described the Legislature which issued most of the repudiated bonds of South Carolina:

"The Report of the Joint Investigating Committee on the Public Frauds of South Carolina, a book of 900 pages, is one of the saddest as well as the most disgraceful pages of our history. The House and Senate of a free State were converted into a bar-room, where wines, liquors and cigars were dispensed free of charge. These supplies were absolutely purchased with the State's money, and for a time a reign of carousing and corruption was inaugurated. The most glaring frauds were committed. It is said that an estimate cannot be formed of the amount of wines, liquors and cigars which were used in a single session; but the bills rendered and the pay certificates issued for this kind of indulgence demonstrate that, to have used all that was purchased,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every member of the House and Senate of South Carolina must have consumed one gallon of whiskey per day, with a few extra bottles of ale and wine thrown in, and smoked not less than a dozen cigars within the same time.

"Prior to this time, legislation in South Carolina had been conducted in a rather primitive form, and without the extravagances of wealthier communities. The old legislature had been contented with five-dollar clocks; the new one purchased six-hundred-dollar clocks; forty-cent spittoons soon gave way to eight-dollar cuspidors; four-dollar benches were abolished to give place to two-hundred-dollar crimson plush sofas. The legislator who was contented to serve his State upon a one-dollar seat, in the new era leisurely lounged upon sixty-dollar plush Gothic chairs; eighty-dollar library desks took the place of four-dollar pine tables; cheap matting was taken up and body Brussels substituted."

Nevertheless, in spite of all excuses, it remains true that, as the Legislature of Georgia, before that State itself began repudiating, said, in a resolution which was ordered to be transmitted to the Governors of all the States, to be by them laid before their respective Legislatures: "We regard the slightest breach of plighted faith, public or private, as the evidence of the want of that moral principle upon which all obligations depend; that, when any State in this Union shall refuse to recognize her great seal as the sufficient evidence of her obligation, she shall have forfeited her station in the sisterhood of States, and will no longer be worthy of their confidence or respect."

By all means, the Southern States should, when they find themselves able, pay every cent of their repudiated debt, even that which they, in good faith, look upon as having been saddled upon them by questionable means. But let not payment be hurried by legal juggling. Let not the devious advantage which the debtor took of the Constitution be met by an even more devious abuse of that document on the part of the creditor. Two wrongs do not make a right.

MARK SULLIVAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BRITISH AND AMERICAN NAVAL EXPENDITURE.

BY LIEUTENANT CARLYON BELLAIRS, R.N.

WE live in an age of mutual insurance, when nations avoid disasters by limiting their liabilities. Risks cannot be avoided, but they can be minimized. To paraphrase a famous saying of Disraeli's, it is the business of statesmen to prevent by policy what war might otherwise effect by force. If there are times when it is wise for diplomacy to remember the maxim of Pascal, that most of the evils of life arise through inability to sit still, there are also tides in the affairs of nations as well as men which, taken at the flood, lead on to success. It is thus Great Britain justifies the Anglo-Japanese agreement. This temporary alliance was an assurance of mutual support so as to prevent the risk of either Power being attacked by more than one hostile nation over a question connected with the future of China or Korea. The essence of a limited alliance is to safeguard the future in peace or war, so that the military forces of both Powers are not called upon to act unless one or the other should be in danger of a great defeat. The abandonment of British claims in Korea had removed a stumbling-block to Anglo-Japanese co-operation. In a similar manner the settlement of the Alaskan boundary question, and the concessions made by Great Britain over the Panama Canal, have considerably improved the relations of Great Britain and the United States. Japan and Great Britain found a common policy in Chinese questions, even as the two branches of the Anglo-Saxon race have found one in certain points of International Law, such as the determination that food is not to be regarded as contraband, unless shown, before a lawfully constituted prize-court, to be probably destined for the enemy's armed forces. It is recognized by American statesmen

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that they can no longer remain indifferent to questions of oversea trade, now that the value of American exports and imports has risen to over $2,500,000,000. Of $1,400,000,000 of exports in 1903, the United States sent over $700,000,000 to the British Empire, as compared with $77,000,000 for France and $19,000,000 for China. On the other hand, Great Britain cannot do without American foodstuffs and cotton; while the future development of the Empire will largely depend upon American capital. This growing interdependence is significant.

The Anglo-Japanese agreement was signed on January 30th, 1902, because, as stated therein, of "the desire that their common policy should find expression in an international contract of binding validity." After January 30th, 1907, one year's notice may be given of the termination of the treaty. This is a distinct flaw, for it takes over two years to build a battle-ship; and, since the cessation of the alliance means a loss of battle-ship power, the notice required should have been about three years, to enable either nation to augment her naval force. So far as the restraint and conduct of the Japanese are concerned, the confidence of Great Britain has been merited; but it is unlikely that the treaty will be renewed, for it may stand in the way of harmonious relations with the United States, which should naturally be one of the highest ideals of British policy. The risks taken by Great Britain were considerable, owing to the reckless ambitions of the Czar's advisers and the closeness of the ties binding France to Russia. Even so, the authors of the treaty may claim that it kept the conflict within measurable bounds. The Japanese were able to concentrate their whole force on the supreme task of driving the Russians from South Manchuria, as all probability of the sea communications of their army being cut by the navy of France or Germany was discounted by the potential strength of the British fleets in the Mediterranean and Channel. Japanese statesmen were well aware that, given adequate training, their naval operations could be forecasted with as much probability as any business which engages the attention of mankind. Though their naval forces were quite inadequate, if material strength were the only factor to be weighed, it is certain that they did not lose sight of the fact that the Russian Admiralty were attempting a well-nigh impossible feat in endeavoring to train a navy on four months' instruction in the year. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was evident that the Russian administration was corrupt, and that its foreign policy was not coordinated to the defensive organization, in that its war preparations only matured in 1907, while diplomacy required military assistance in 1904. Just as sea-power was the indispensable condition of the operations of the allies in the Crimea, and of the British army in South Africa, so it has been with the Japanese in this war. If ever, at some future date, the United States should desire to prevent European nations from attacking Brazil or menacing American interests in Syria and China, it could only be effectively done by the use of sea-power previously built up with the most careful forethought and expenditure during a long period of peace. A good example will be found in the German Navy Bill of 1900, involving an additional expenditure during twenty years of nearly $460,000,000. Every detail of the expansion, repair and replacement of ships, men and dockyards, was thought out in advance for each year with due regard to the capacity of the country to bear the expenditure.

That mere population and riches are no match in war against such careful organization, we have seen in the case of Russia. It is only the knowledge that the sea-barrier is impenetrable which will effectually prevent the expanding Teutonic, Slavonic and Latin races of Europe from contemplating aggression on the American continent. If unable to do so singly, nothing but sea-power will prevent them from trying to effect their purpose in combination. They have combined in the past for the partition of Poland. By the Russian declaration of February 26th, 1780, Russia, France, Spain, Holland, Prussia, Sweden and Denmark combined to resist the right of search, and the same Powers were acting together against Great Britain over this question in 1800. In 1807, Great Britain had to break Napoleon's compulsory alliance, framed by the treaty of Tilsit, by seizing eighteen Danish and eight Portuguese battle-ships, and by blockading the Russian battle-ships. Thus a fresh union of over 140 battle-ships was nipped in the bud, but such decisive action could not have been taken had not Great Britain been in the plenitude of her naval strength with 212 battle-ships. We learn that, within a period of twenty-seven years, there were three European alliances of three or more Great Powers against Great Britain, and all were broken up by the operations of sea-power.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

France, Germany and Russia combined in 1895 to drive Japan out of China, for what they believed to be their own ultimate benefit; and we know that armed interference was meditated in the American-Spanish war of 1898. If it were urged that the rivalries of Slav and Teuton prevent an effective combination, I might instance from history cases in which statesmen of different nations have thought it the lesser evil to divert a struggle between their countries by exaggerating the mutual difficulties or temptations in another direction. It is sufficient for the present to mention the case of Frederick the Great, who, in 1769, wrote that "Russia is a terrible Power. . . . I foresee no other remedy than in time forming a league of the Great Powers to resist this dangerous torrent." In 1772, he preferred to cooperate with Russia in the first dismemberment of Poland.

It is in their stragetical aspects that naval combinations are to be feared, for they cause the dispersion of the enemy's fleets in order to protect interests which are menaced by the ships of each party to the combination. Tactically, where allied fleets have been combined, they have never been nearly as dangerous as the mere total material force might suggest. Thus, strategically, so great was the dispersion of British battle-ships brought about in 1779 and 1780 by the alliance of the United States, France, Spain and Holland that, on occasions, though Great Britain possessed 133 battle-ships in 1779 and 145 in 1780, she was only able to oppose thirty-six battle-ships in the Channel to sixty-six in the allied fleets of France and Spain, and in 1780 only twenty-one to forty-nine of the allies. Yet so great is the tactical weakness of allied fleets that her opposition was successful. The instability of European alliances is another cause of want of vigor in battle; in the wars from 1793 to 1814, Russia changed sides three times. Again, when Spain "assisted" Great Britain at Toulon, she prevented the complete overthrow of the French naval power; because it was not to the interest of Spain that France should be unduly weakened. Such a consideration could not appeal to an Anglo-Saxon alliance. In addition, it should be mentioned that tactical weakness is much less obvious where language and methods are so identical as in two nations sprung from a common stem, a point to be remembered in considering an Anglo-Saxon combination.

The fact that it is in their strategical aspects that naval coali-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions are to be feared is of especial importance in the case of a Power circumstanced as is the United States, with her Pacific and Atlantic fleets separated by the coast-line of a whole continent. In the disposition of her fleets the United States could not, under existing conditions, neglect to watch the actions of neutrals. An understanding with Great Britain would be of the utmost value in conferring strategic freedom, for it would enable the United States to apply the first principles of war and concentrate her fleets at the decisive points. Fortified by such an agreement, it ought not again to be necessary to send a telegram to an admiral, as was done to Admiral Sampson, saying: "The matter is left in your discretion, except that the United States armored vessels must not be risked."

I am well aware of the ideal laid down by Washington that "the great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible." In the Monroe declaration, the determination is expressed not to meddle with the internal affairs of other states; and in the Hague Convention the American representatives insisted on the traditional policy of not intruding upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in, the political questions or policy or internal administration of any foreign state. The answer is obvious. The independence of the United States would not have been won in the eighteenth century if there had not been an alliance between the United States and European nations, and no subject has been so fruitful of diplomatic entanglement as the extension of commerce, with all the thorny questions of right of search, contraband of war and blockade. Thus the determination of Russia to prevent the opening of new consulates and treaty ports in Manchuria was directly aimed at the United States. The hostility of Germany has been obvious ever since the United States reaffirmed and amplified the Monroe Doctrine, and took an active interest in territorial affairs outside America, as at Samoa, for it should never be forgotten that, since the judgment of the Supreme Court in 1901, the United States has become an Empire as well as a Republic, peopled by subjects as well as citizens.

A different argument to that of Washington is that the United States is self-contained and her external relations are, therefore, of comparative unimportance. She does not, therefore, it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

argued, need a navy to enable her to win success in war. The answer was given by President Roosevelt, in 1902, when he said: "If the navy fails us, then we are doomed to defeat, no matter what may be our material wealth or the high average of our citizenship. It should, therefore, be an object of prime importance for every patriotic American to see that the navy is constantly built up and, above all, is kept at the highest point of efficiency both in *matériel* and in *personnel*." On the plea of self-containment, the Spanish war was a mistake, and the Monroe Doctrine and its recent amplifications are absurdities. To promulgate a law to guard the whole of America and the neutrality of the Panama Canal, and then to refuse to provide necessary police on the sea for these purposes, is to follow the Chinese system of make-believe. In the course of a message to Congress, President Roosevelt said: "We have deliberately made our own certain foreign policies demanding the possession of a first-class navy." He then showed that without an adequate navy the Isthmian canal would be merely a hostage to any stronger Power. The Monroe Doctrine, he declared, was an idle assertion unless the United States could back it by force of arms. "It can be backed up only by a thoroughly strong navy." To refuse the latter was "to invite trouble and, if trouble came, it would insure disaster." Captain Mahan has shown the probability of foreign complications in his "Lessons of the War with Spain":

"There is a large and growing German colony in southern Brazil, and I am credibly informed that there is a distinct effort to divert thither, by means direct or indirect, a considerable part of the emigration which now comes to the United States, and therefore is lost politically to Germany—for she has, of course, no prospect of colonization here. The inference is that the Emperor hopes at a future day, for which he is young enough to wait, to find in southern Brazil a strong German population, which in due time may seek to detach itself; and which may then seek political union with Germany, to obtain support against her former owners and masters. Without advancing any particular opinion as to the advisable geographical limits of the Monroe Doctrine, we may be pretty sure that the American people would resent an act which in our press would be called 'the aggression of a European military monarchy upon the political or territorial rights of an American republic.' This also could be accompanied with the liberal denunciation of William II. which now ornaments our editorial columns; but hard words break no bones, and the practical question would remain, 'What are you going to do about it,' with a navy 'for defence only?'"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In twelve years, the United States' naval expenditure has trebled, while that of Great Britain has doubled; and, in considering the American expenditure, a large proportion of the coming outlay on the Isthmian canal should be regarded as for the navy. Great Britain now annually spends on her navy during peace twice as much as the largest sum she ever devoted to that force during war, and the amount has been increasing at the rate of $9,000,000 a year. These great increases have been brought about in both countries by a definite policy which aims at naval supremacy as against the other maritime Powers. It is such considerations which weighed considerably with the writer when, in association with a lifelong observer and one of the greatest of British naval authorities, Lord Brassey, he undertook a general review of the naval policy of the Powers for the "Encyclopædia Britannica." It was not possible in such a work to indicate a controversial solution which appeared both feasible and reasonable, viz., that the two nations should mutually guarantee each other against a possible alliance of three Powers, so that some limit might be set to the burden of their naval armaments. For, let no patriotic American delude himself into the belief that the present naval expenditure is any measure of what is yet to come. The ships built have to be manned, maintained and replaced. In Great Britain, the past naval programmes have averaged three battle-ships and five cruisers each year, and these will have to be replaced. In the United States the programme averaged about two battle-ships and two cruisers, while, owing to the difficulties of augmenting the navy, some of the ships now building are nearly three years overdue. In Great Britain it is the exception and not the rule for cruisers to last as much as twenty years, notwithstanding that the most expensive repairs are carried out. As for manning, the United States has only commenced to touch the fringe of the question of dealing with a *personnel* costing six times as much per head as that of the German navy. The report of the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation in 1901 showed this clearly enough when he wrote:

"It has always been the policy of the Government to regard its regular establishment of the Navy and Army as a nucleus about which a larger establishment would be formed in case of war. The present establishment, however, can no longer be considered as an effective nucleus

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for such a purpose. It barely sufficed for the Spanish war; and, were the fleet to be manned with full complements, as it would necessarily be if called upon to fight a first-class European Power, the present *personnel* would barely form one-fourth of the total establishment."

Such a state of affairs is little short of disastrous, for at least one European Power, Germany, is fully alive to the necessity of of a trained naval *personnel* in these days of complicated war vessels.

In 1878, Mr. Gladstone was able to declare that "the strength of England is not to be found in alliances with great military Powers, but it is to be found henceforth in the efficiency and supremacy of her navy—a navy as powerful now as the navies of all Europe." Naval supremacy is, however, based on economic supremacy. Gladstone spoke in a day when Great Britain's economic predominance was uncontested. He urged the necessity for great economy in order to reduce the national debt before the cheap supplies of coal, to which he traced the wealth of Britain, should begin to give out. The total naval expenditure of Great Britain has now risen to over $200,000,000 a year, and the Admiralty have been authoritatively informed that the limit has been reached. In the desire to maintain her policy of avoiding entanglements with the military nations of Europe, it is natural that she should turn to her own kith and kin. The Colonies are not developed enough to help her to the extent of much more than the present one per cent. of her naval outlay; and even so, American capital must play an important part in bringing them to the state of full-grown nations. It is to the westward that the brightest eyes in Great Britain are turning to look for the expected reinforcements. The Prime Minister and the leaders of both parties in the House of Lords, July 27th, 1900, all expressed the view that never in the history of Great Britain has there been such an extraordinary antipathy for her as then existed among the peoples of Europe. Like a storm it arose, and the governments of Europe kept it in check because Great Britain's real foreign minister, a strong navy, was on guard. The lesson was a striking exemplification of the advice De Tocqueville gave to the United States, when he wrote that "experience proves no commercial prosperity can be durable if it cannot be united, in case of need, to naval force." Solon said much the same thing to Crœsus, in pointing out that if another came whose iron was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the stronger he would take away all the gold. But if the iron itself is so costly as to cause the gold to dwindle, then Crœsus must look round for others to share the burden.

The United States is approaching a similar problem. Solon, if he had lived to-day, would have declared that nations struggle both with gold and with iron, and the ceaseless industrial strife is becoming the more exacting of the two wars. Thus money abstracted from the pockets of the people for unproductive military purposes clearly cannot fructify in the industry of the people. In ten years, the expenditure of Great Britain has risen fifty per cent. If, then, there can be identity of interest on the part of the two Anglo-Saxon nations, who both glory in the costlier form of voluntary military service, and who differ from European nations in that they deny their Governments the means of raising revenue by the monopoly of railways, drink or tobacco, is it not possible for them to limit their expenditure by the guarantee of mutual assistance under certain circumstances?

America's path is beset by great dangers, and the disadvantages of waging war both in the Atlantic and in the Pacific are palpable. Cooperation between her fleets can at present only be effected by a transfer like the "Oregon's" famous voyage of 15,000 miles in fifty-nine days. Apparently, American expansion is even less acceptable to Europe than that of the British Empire, owing to the high protective tariff and monopoly of the coasting-trade favored by the United States. Both the Kaiser and the Czar are men in the prime of life, and both are penetrated with the doctrine of Divine Right contained in the declaration of the Monarchs of the Holy Alliance, May 12th, 1821, the words of which are worth recalling:

> "Useful or necessary changes in legislation and in the administration of States ought only to emanate from the free will and the intelligent and well-weighed conviction of those whom God has rendered responsible for power. . . . Penetrated with this eternal truth, the Sovereigns have not hesitated to proclaim it with frankness and vigor; they have declared that, in respecting the rights and independence of all legitimate power, they regarded as legally null, and as disavowed by the principles which constitute the public right of Europe, all pretended reform operated by revolt and open hostility."

It was Canning who had to urge and insist that the United States was threatened by this declaration of the three monarchs,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and by the actions of France. The Monroe Doctrine, which was then promulgated, was aimed both at Russian ideas of sovereignty in America and at the intervention of the Holy Alliance in the Spanish colonies. In each case the United States was assured of the support of Great Britain, though she failed in attracting British adhesion to the view that future settlements could not be established, as in past times, in unoccupied territories. So far as material interests were at stake, it must be acknowledged that the ability to prevent joint European action in the Spanish colonies lay chiefly in the support of the British fleets, which, throughout the period when the Holy Alliance was plotting, numbered 131 to 145 battle-ships. Would not a similar cause prevent a like coalition from operating to-day? Briefly, my definite proposal is that the United States and Great Britain, having found that their policies are identical and that neither Power can be successfully attacked except from the sea, should jointly agree to come to each other's assistance in the event of either Power being threatened by a coalition of three maritime Powers. The nations under this heading are France, Germany, Italy, Russia and Japan. A special clause should exclude Japan until January 30th, 1908. The agreement should be terminable at three years' notice. While such an agreement does not constitute the open alliance once advocated in this REVIEW, it would undoubtedly be a desirable insurance, and would confer future benefit on both countries by arresting the growth of naval expenditure. The proposal is agreeable to the spirit of what Jefferson wrote in 1823:

> "Great Britain is the nation that can do us most harm of any one, or all, on earth; and with her on our side we need not fear the whole world. With her we should most sedulously nourish a cordial friendship; and nothing would tend more to knit our affections than to be fighting once more side by side in the same cause—not that I would purchase even her amity by taking part in her wars."

The concluding caution was needed in view of the policy of meddlesome interference once pursued by Great Britain in European affairs, a policy now happily recognized as impossible in the future. The above advice was given by the ex-President to President Monroe, when the latter consulted him as to the issue of the famous Doctrine, which, as Monroe stated in his letter to Jefferson, was only issued in America and not in England, in order

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to prevent the irritation in Europe which such a step would cause because of "our union with her (Great Britain) being marked."

President Roosevelt in all his messages and speeches mentions only a war with one Power; but Jefferson, who knew European diplomacy well, saw clearly that the real danger lay in a combination of Powers. Thus President Roosevelt said in 1902:

"If we are not prepared to back up words by deeds, it is far better to omit the words. I believe in the Monroe Doctrine with all my heart. I believe in asserting it, because I believe the American people are willing to back it up. But it never can be backed up by words alone. If it became to the interest of some great Power to violate it, most assuredly that great Power would do so, if it thought that we could only bluster and threaten, or if it was believed our force was too weak to be formidable in a fight. A good navy is absolutely essential, if we intend to treat the Monroe Doctrine as we should treat it, that is, as the cardinal feature of our foreign policy."

If now we substitute the word "Powers" for "Power," we see how stupendous would be the task before the United States with her fleets so widely separated by the coast-line of a continent. The solution lies now in British aid, as it did in 1823. Over twenty years before, Jefferson had written:

"The day that France takes possession of New Orleans fixes the sentence that is to restrain her forever within her low-water mark. It seals the union of two nations, who, in conjunction, can maintain exclusive possession of the ocean. From that moment we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation."

The words are as true to-day concerning a combination of Powers, with Germany at their head, as they were in 1802 concerning France. It is not for show purposes that the German navy has expanded in fifty years from a single corvette and two gunboats to the present large and homogeneous fleet concentrated in one mass at its own home dockyards. Germany now has one-fourth of her population dependent on foreign food. The nation grows at a rate of seven millions in ten years. She sees that her sons are lost to her by emigration. Such colonies as she possesses offer no future careers, for their trade is only equal to the total cost of government. The temptation, therefore, to intrigue in Brazil, Syria and China is well-nigh irresistible; and in the future, as in 1898, America's difficulty will be Germany's opportunity. It was even as with France, in 1864, when Napoleon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III. hoped to found a new Empire in Mexico under cover of Maximilian's rule.

There is a strategy in diplomacy as well as in war which is known as the "double objective," and it is so called from the fact that, until the eve of striking the blow, little is known to the victim from which of two directions it will come. Napoleon played it off successfully up to a point, in connection with his schemes for the invasion of England. The Emperor William dangles Great Britain so persistently before his Parliament, when pleading for the navy, as to prompt the suspicion that the real objective may be America. The whole scheme falls to the ground if the United States and Great Britain are united. Now neither of the two nations can hope to command the sea, against the rest of the world, in all the coming years; and ominous protests, on the part of Democrats in America and a section of the Liberal party in Great Britain, against naval expenditure, are already being heard, in spite of the fact that several European navies reach their maximum expansion in 1908. The Titanic task which is beyond their powers singly might be borne with ease if they were partners. Alliance is dictated by common prudence, for the defeat of either Power on the sea would cause a grave financial crisis, and cut off producers from consumers in a great cotton, provision and cereal market. The monopoly of maritime war now belongs to seven Powers. If Great Britain and the United States mutually insure themselves against a war with three or more of the remaining five, the old game of coalitions will forever be stopped. The other Powers may be neglected, for either their geographical or their economical position is an absolute bar to any rivalry.

For the cost of one battle-ship of to-day Great Britain could have placed in line at the battle of the Nile twice as many as were actually present under Nelson. Hence to-day the vital difference is that the industrial factors, in furnishing the sinews of war, are controlling forces of the situation. The proposed alliance offers facilities to shipping along 61,000 miles of coast as compared with 13,000 for France and Germany, and another 18,000, mostly icebound, for Russia. The two countries consumed nearly 50,000,000 metric tons of iron, in 1902, as compared with less than 33,000,000 for France, Germany and Russia. They produced twenty-six million tons of pig-iron, as compared

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with about thirteen million tons for the three nations, and over twenty-two million tons of steel as compared with nine million tons. They control the banking operations of the world. They have the complete monopoly of the smokeless-coal supply. No less than seventy-two per cent. of the world's coal-supply in 1903 was controlled by the two nations. The United States has the virtual monopoly of the cotton, and the British Empire of the world's wool, supply. While these and numerous other material advantages exist, there is increasing evidence of individuals having anticipated the Governments in the matter of partnerships. The Governments can stimulate these partnerships by extending the boons of cheap postage and telegraphy, and by facilitating the transfer of money and securities. Since 1815 the United Kingdom has sent nearly fifteen millions of her population into North America. No political question divides the United States and Great Britain. Indeed, the United States is now lending money to develop the British Empire and so hastening on the day when the burden of armaments may be still further distributed, for the Colonies will be able to contribute more than the present one per cent. of Great Britain's naval outlay.

My proposal for a limited alliance has been dealt with in this article as a business proposition. I have done so because in a good cause sentiment is an excess. At the proper time, in the stress of difficulties, the sailors of both countries, who are the frontier diplomatists, have used words such as those of Commodore Josiah Tattnall, and their English "Hurrahs" have rung out for each other in the teeth of the hurricane at Samoa. Those are hallowed memories, showing that separation only came to cement us closer together; closer than when we owed allegiance to one King and one Parliament, and our united navy wrested America from the domination of France and Spain. Therefore, I feel certain that when in need of each other the Anglo-Saxons will march together. So long, however, as prevention is better than cure, so long must it be true that the agreement which would have prevented a war is better than the assistance which averts a defeat.

CARLYON BELLAIRS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE IRISH MUSE.—II.

BY FIONA MACLEOD.

"Poor people, they have nothing to think about," said a Highland fisherman to me once, after his return from a visit to London at the laird's expense, at the time of the Fisheries Exhibition. That was the final impression of the Londoners that this island Gael brought away with him: a people far more distraction-seeking and distracted than any he had known or indeed imagined, but so preoccupied with idle and momentary things that, as he said with kindly commiseration, "poor people, they have nothing to think about." The wind, the sea, the sky, the travelling cloud and the untravelling hill, these ministers of thought, so familiar, so inseparable from his whole inward life, were nothing to this people who instead had newspapers, and too many books, and continual rumor. And for the Anglo-Celtic writer it is surely evident that for him the habit of mind of the "ignorant" islander is an immeasurably better habit of the mind than the hurried and fragmentary habit of mind of the Londoner and his kind.

On the all-important subject of nationality I am glad to find so admired and influential a critic as Mr. Stopford Brooke explicit. "Right or wrong," he says, "nationality is the deepest thing in Ireland, and it is a multitudinous absurdity for England to try to ignore it. Even if it were wrong, as it is not, all laws or any government which do not take it into the highest consideration are bound to fail dismally in Ireland. It stands also to reason that, if Irish nationality be so deep a thing, the Irish nature which ignores it is bound to be inferior, in life and originality, to that which is inspired by it. And such is the case. The Irish poetry which follows the English tradition too often wears an imitative look, languishes into subtleties, or dreams into commonplace. Were it possible that Irish literature should be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Anglicized, there would soon be no literature worth the name in Ireland."

Mr. Brooke rightly puts it again when he says: "The only questions Art asks are: 'Is it well done? Was it worth the doing?'" It depends on how we come to the Irish Muse, as revealed to us in this "Treasury," whether we can say of modern Irish poetry as a whole that it appears worth the doing and to be well done, in the high sense where worth in effort and achievement is definitely in the sphere of art. With any other worth of effort and achievement we have nothing to do at present, for we are not considering the spontaneous songs and rude threnodies of a people, but the shaped and colored beauty in verse of the conscious servants of the Irish Muse.

The editors of this anthology admit at once that they found they could not compile a book of a relatively high standard of excellence that would also be adequately representative. They have separated their collection into six books, which, though they unavoidably overlap, are genuine and not arbitrary sections. But a more definite division suggests itself: Irish poetry (that is, Irish poetry in English) before Mangan and Ferguson, and Irish poetry after Mangan and Ferguson.

True, there were real and fine poets before Ferguson touched the epic note or Mangan gave to the too facile Irish lyric a steadfast pulse of flame. The familiar name of Thomas Moore will occur at once. So admirable in its combined insight and justice is the criticism of Mr. Brooke that I do not scruple to excerpt its essential part from the context, and the more readily as English critics habitually misplace Moore, ranking him either too high or too low, and either as an English poet with Byron and Scott or as a typical Irish poet, whereas he is neither to be ranked with Byron and Scott (as for the claim that he is the Burns of Ireland, it is not worth discussion) as a writer of English verse, nor as an Irish poet in the sense in which Mangan, Samuel Ferguson and their successors are Irish poets. "Moore," writes Mr. Brooke, "is neither a truly Celtic nor a truly English poet. The deep things in the Irish nature were not in him. No mysticism made him dream; no hunger for the spiritual world beset him; no fairyland, sometimes gracious, but chiefly terrible, was more real to him than the breathing world. No sadness without a known cause, no joy whose source was uncomprehended, influenced him. Nature did

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not speak to him of dreadful and obscure powers, or of beauty and love and eternal youth beyond mortal reach, but not beyond immortal desire. The love of his country was no passion. None of these Celtic elements belonged to him, and they and others are at the roots of Celtic imagination. Nor did he replace them by the elements of English imagination. His poetry is no more English than Irish in character. It does not grow naturally out of the tree of English poetry; it is a graft upon it. He does not descend from any poetical ancestors in England, and he has had no influence on any of the English poets that followed him. He stands, as I have said, curiously alone. Had he had imagination, he would have been in brotherhood with either English, Scottish, or Irish poets. But he is a curious instance of a poet who never, save perhaps in one or two songs, deviates into imaginative work. On the other hand, he is a master in fancy, a poet so full of that power which plays with grace and brightness on the surface of Nature and man, but which never penetrates, that few if any have ever showed so well what fancy could do, when quite alone, and enjoying herself, apart from her nobler sister, imagination."

Moore had two contemporaries, an obscure Irish clergyman and a misanthropic Ulsterman who drifted to an unregarded life in London, who touched a higher note both in "occasional" and, even, in fanciful poetry than we ever achieved or even approached. Charles Wolfe may be but a name to thousands, but the whole Anglo-Celtic world in both hemispheres is familiar with that solemn, simple, and moving dirge, "The Burial of Sir John Moore." After reading, wholly unaffected by even a dim poetic echo, each of Mr. Brooke's selections from Thomas Moore, I turned to Wolfe's "Lines Written to Music," and found there, though they are not of the rarer kinds of lyric verse, a charm and air of beauty foreign to the facile muse of the more celebrated poet:

> "If I had thought thou couldst have died
> I might not weep for thee;
> But I forgot, when by thy side,
> That thou couldst mortal be."

How different the note of simplicity and sincerity here to those other lines, "On Music," with their tawdry ornamentalism:

> "Like the gale that sighs along
> Beds of oriental flowers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is the grateful breath of song
That once was heard in happier hours."

Still more remote from Moore is George Darley, a poet of genius, of a powerful and extraordinary imagination, but of an imagination so uncontrolled in its highest service and so disordered in its worst tyranny that Darley must of necessity remain a name for the few only, and these even must look into the wilderness of his strange verse as travellers upon a spellbound and perilous waste which, through distorted cactus and agave, reveals scattered oases of a ravishing beauty or sombre flame-like splendor. We cannot even imagine Moore writing verse (to leave aside the obscurities of "Nepenthe" or the too involved fairy-world delicacies of "Sylvia") such as "The Hymn to the Sun," with its titanic imagery; or the sounding quatrains of "The Fallen Star" —the star that had sat upon his orb of fire for flaming ages; or that most unconventional love-poem on womanly beauty, called "True Loveliness," with its bitter note:

"He who the Siren's hair would win
Is mostly strangled in the tide."

But before Moore, or standing far apart and on the higher if ruggeder slopes—and apart also from that blithe and delightful band of light-hearted singers of the humorous, so sane and sweet and justly loved, from Samuel Lover and Charles Lever and Francis Mahony to Alfred Perceval Graves, who, it may be added, has written the finest modern lullaby—are others better deserving our memory, though without a fraction of Moore's foreign renown. The anonymous balladists, too, have given Ireland many compositions which are, perhaps, the more treasured as they are rather the rude voice of the national life than the woven verse of any single poet. To these, perhaps, adequate justice has not been done. Again, there has been undue deprecation and ignoring, on one side of the Irish Sea at least, of the poets who chanted under the banner of Thomas Davis.

For myself, I find an abiding and strong emotion in the upwelling songs and ballads of the poets of "The Nation." These may not have the beauty of art become conscious and masterly, but they have the beauty of emotional life become rhythmic and persuasive. Poland and Ireland have given to the world the most passionately ardent hymns, as well as the saddest dirges of modern

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

times. Every time I reread these poems of the group known as "The poets of 'The Nation'" I am deeply moved, not only by their burning patriotism and their high and pure spiritual emotion, but by the genuine poetic flame which burns behind their generally somewhat crude and conventional art. Carleton, Gerald Griffin, Callanan, Edward Walsh, who come a little earlier, are poets who, to-day, with the wild turbulence of their period grown quiet (though through depth not waste of national resolve, it may be), and with a careful art such as is now more possible for the Irish poet, might stand in the front rank of Celtic singers. Among all the men and women who formed the group of "The Nation," under the beloved leadership of Thomas Davis, himself truly a remarkable poet, there is none who had not a real faculty. Munster will not forget the boy-poet who wrote "The Munster War-Song," nor Tipperary the exiled Mary Kelly who made the name of "the honey-sweet land" fragrant for all its sons and daughters: the "rebels of Cork" will remember Michael Barry's chant of "The Sword" as long as there is a "rebel" left, burning to redress the wrong. For generations, Geoghegan's "After Aughrim" will be sung or recited by the Irish Jacobites—for the "Jacobitism" which is but another name for the beauty of a great idea lives yet, and deeply, in the Irish as in the Scottish Gael. As for Gavan Duffy and Thomas Davis, when their names are forgotten, "the green" will be seen no more from Rathlin to Kinsale. It is a great thing to write a poem of flawless beauty; but, were I Irish, I would rather have written Davis's noble "Stanzas on Nationality"—the noblest "Flag of Freedom" hymn in any language—than the most flawless music of later song. No patriot, Irish or English or of any land, could wish a better thing than that these noble, lofty, and grandly temperate lines should become the heart-song and inspiration of the younger generations. The poem has the anthem-music of moral greatness. Its opening lines may one day be the tocsin of freedom, heard from the wastes of Siberia to the cliffs of Moher:

> "A nation's voice, a nation's voice—
> It is a solemn thing!"

In other circumstances, Thomas Davis might have become Ireland's greatest poet. Facile, conventional and hurried, as much of his verse is, it is seldom that the poet does not stand visible

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

behind the fine and worthy versifier. None but a poet could have created that image in the verses on a peasant girl of Bantry, where her brow gleamed beneath her raven hair like

"A breaker spread white 'neath a shadowy cliff."

One of the few survivors of "The Nation" group, Mr. Martin MacDermot, has written a lyric that may live in future anthologies and in the memories of all who love the lyric muse, his all but perfect "Girl of the Red Mouth," from which I must afford myself the pleasure of quoting two stanzas, the first and last:

"Girl of the red mouth,
Love me! Love me!
Girl of the red mouth
Love me!
'Tis by its curve, I know,
Love fashioneth his bow,
And bends it—ah, even so!
Oh, girl of the red mouth, love me!

"Girl of the low voice,
Love me! Love me!
Girl of the sweet voice
Love me!
Like the echo of a bell,—
Like the bubbling of a well—
Sweeter! Love within doth dwell,—
Oh, girl of the low voice, love me!"

Poets whose strains may still catch, if they do not charm, the listener are also to be found among the group who come immediately after that of "The Nation," from Lady Wilde to Fanny Parnell. There is extant a wonderful little cavalier song by Sheridan Le Fanu, by which the admirers of that remarkable romancist will be sorry not to see him represented. Ireland will long remember John Walsh, who wrote "Drimin Donn Dilis," one of the sad strains of eviction-literature; and the young patriot, John Keegan Casey (whose touch of genius and tragic end in gaol, while still a youth, have given him the glory of a fixed star in the firmament of Irish memories and ideals) will always be associated with the thrilling Fenian lyric "The Rising of the Moon," and with the Burns-like love-song to "Maire my girl." Francis O'Donnell's "Spinning Song" is deservedly popular, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in America is ranked with the most loved home-poems of Longfellow and Whittier. There is, however, one poet whose work is truly remarkable, and might with controlled power and that faculty of economy in word and phrase, that nurture of the form, which is the technique of verbal art, have become a high possession. But, like George Darley, Thomas Irwin must, as his editor observes, be ranked only as a great but unrealized possibility in modern Irish literature. In his powerful "Stanzas on Cæsar" (from which I excerpt four) there is a note of tragic solemnity which in manner also recalls the "Nineveh" of Rossetti:

"Within the dim museum room,
'Mid dusty marbles, drowned in light,
Black Indian idols, deep-sea bones,
Gods, nymphs, and uncouth skeletons,
One statua of stately height
Shines from an old nook's shifting gloom.

"'Tis he whose name around the earth
Has rolled in History's echoing dreams;
An antique shape of Destiny,
A soul dæmonic, born to be
A king or nothing—moulded forth
From giant Nature's fierce extremes.

"His was a policy like fate
That shapes to-day for future hours;
The sovran foresight his to draw
From crude events their settled law,
To learn the soul, and turn the weight
Of human passions into powers.

"His was the mathematic might
That moulds results from men and things—
The eye that pierces at a glance,
The will that wields all circumstance,
The starlike soul of force and light
That moves etern on tireless wings;"

or his powerful quatrains on Fate, that

"Clothed in equanimity, beholds
A blossom wither or a world decay;"

or those on the old theme of "The Skull," but with an individuality of emotion and expression which forbid the familiar comparison:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Strange shape! the earth has ruins manifold,
But none with meaning terrible as thine.

"For here beneath this bleak and sterile dome
Did hatred rage, and silent sorrow mourn—
A little world, an infinite spirit's home,
A heaven or hell abandoned and forlorn.

"Here thought on thought arose, like star on star,
And love, deemed deathless, habited; and now
An empty mausoleum, vainer far
Than Cheops' mountain pyramid, art thou."

It is something of the same deep note, wrought in a more intense emotion become tragic, that we find in the closing poem of the first half of this "Treasury of Irish Poetry": the celebrated address to the dreamed-of Ireland that is yet to be, by Fanny Parnell. Through its vibrating passion it has a music and a significance for the Irish people which will never be forgotten.

"Art," says Mr. Stopford Brooke in his admirable Introduction to this Irish Treasury, "Art is pleased with the ballads, war songs, political and humorous poetry, and with the songs of love and of peasant life, but she does not admit them into her inner shrine. It is only quite lately that modern Irish poetry can claim to be fine art. But it has now, in what is called the Celtic Revival, reached that point."

This recent Irish poetry is headed by Mangan and Samuel Ferguson, but it follows more the lead of the latter, for one of its more obvious traits is a return to ancient Gaelic legend, to the well-springs of Gaelic symbolism, beauty, and inspiration. Moreover, not only is the sentiment for Ireland of the Irish poets of to-day attuned to a less passionate note than that which we find in Mangan and Fanny Parnell and Thomas Davis, but all have the consciousness that, in lyric intensity, at least, none can dream to equal or even to approach the "Dark Rosaleen" of Clarence Mangan, in which the flame of the national life, the sob of the national heart-break, the faith of the national soul, culminated in one supreme lyrical outcry.

Mangan's poetry, at its highest, has an intensity that no Irish poet has equalled. But he is never the supreme artist. He had little care for finality in the face and form of his verse: or, perhaps, the "care" was too exacting a strain for one upon whose

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

frail strength and shattered nerves the burthen of life and the sense of an evil destiny too heavily pressed. As Mr. Lionel Johnson says in his finely sympathetic and interpretative essay—the most admirable piece of prose in this anthology—"dreaming his unattainable and inexpressible dreams, he resigned into the hands of Fate and Chance both his self-control and the control of his art." The whole pathetic story of Clarence Mangan is told in these words. Even in "Dark Rosaleen"—which Mr. Johnson justly calls foremost among the world's poems of inspired patriotism—one encounters an instance of extraordinary blindness to anticlimax: where, after wild but beautiful and apt hyperboles as to what in his impassioned love for "Dark Rosaleen," the Ireland of Heart's Desire, he would do, he adds the almost grotesquely lame climax, "Oh! I could kneel all night in prayer, to heal your many ills." "Gone in the Wind" is truly "a magnificent threnody," but that is not a perfected lyrical poem that can wear so tawdry a line as "Raving of knowledge—and Satan so busy to blind." Mangan is finest when most Irish, and no Gael at least could read unthrilled "O'Hussey's Ode to The Maguire" or the "Lament for the Princes of Tir-Owen and Tir-Connell." The contrast between detailed description and that synthesis in music and nomenclature, which only the masters have, may be instanced by a few lines from the last-named poem. Read, first, for example, the often quoted and much admired "Wicklow Scene from the Summit of Lugnaquilla" by Mr. Savage Armstrong—so excellent in its kind—and then these few lines:

> "Beside the wave, in Donegal,
> In Antrim's glen or fair Dromore,
> Or Killillee,
> Or where the sunny waters fall
> At Assaroe, near Erna's shore,
> This could not be."

One could not recall a line of the former after the book was laid aside, but one does not, cannot, forget "Beside the wave, in Donegal" or "Where the sunny waters fall at Assaroe."

If there is little lyric magic of this kind in the poetry of Samuel Ferguson, there is the magic of a splendid and epical Celtic imagination. But he, too, could paint with magic brush, or recreate the visible world through magic sound, as in that marvel-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lous vision of the sea and the coasts from a great headland in "Congal," "the wide pale-heaving floor crisped by a curling wind," with its "slant cerulean-skirted showers," with "a drowsy sound heard inward," among the high grassy solitudes "thronged by the mountain-mottling sheep." "Congal," "Deirdrê," "The Naming of Cuchullin" and "The Lays of the Red Branch" have redirected the stream of contemporary Irish genius. At base, that genius has more in common with the titanic and shadowy and terrible imagery of "Congal" than with the blithe and rollicking strains which are commonly supposed to be almost exclusively characteristic of the Irish Gael. It is no exaggeration to say that the so-called Celtic Revival owes its impetus and early nurture to Samuel Ferguson, and in a secondary but very real degree to the eloquent pen of Standish O'Grady. These pioneers, with Eugene O'Curry, S. Hayes O'Grady and others, including Whitley Stokes, Kuno Meyer, Dr. George Henderson, have prepared a soil whence has already arisen some of the fairest, and whence will yet arise the loveliest and finest, flowering of the Irish genius. To Ferguson, indeed, even the foremost Irish metricist of to-day owes much in his own technique. The magic cadence of "The Lake Isle of Innisfree" is clearly a conscious or unconscious reminiscence of the delicate music of Ferguson's "Fairy Thorn":

> "They're glancing through the glimmer of the quiet eve,
> Away in milky wavings of neck and ankle bare;
> The heavy-sliding stream in its sleepy song they leave,
> And the crags in the ghostly air."

After Ferguson, Irish poetry divides into the verse which follows the English tradition in manner, but is still inspired by Celtic themes, and that which is too strongly animated by an emotion not English either in itself or its source to be called other than the admittedly vague "Celtic," or the awkward Anglo-Gaelic—the poetry of the Celtic Revival. In other words, the effort of the Gaelic Muse to remember, to feel, to sing as the Gaelic Muse and not as the English Muse; but, in this effort, to seek a rare, and if possible perfected, art, in the noblest of modern languages, a supreme tongue now, and, for all of us of the homelands a common and equal right, so that Kent can no more claim it than Cantyre, or Devon than Donegal.

There is another group, but hardly worthy of much attention:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the group of those who belong to the first main section, but are as English in sentiment and interests as in the literary conventions they follow but do not illuminate. These are simply camp-followers, who happen to have been born in "West Britain."

In the first group the most eminent name is that of Aubrey De Vere. Mr. De Vere's poetry has not the epical strength of Ferguson's nor the metrical variety and beauty of that of Mr. Yeats—and modern Irish poetry lies between the "Congal" of Sir Samuel Ferguson and "The Shadowy Waters" of Mr. Yeats—but it is always fine, always the utterance of a poet, and has often a singular beauty and nobility.

I will not, however, add now more than mere mention of living Irish poets. Those who love the Irish Muse know, or will soon or late discover, the verve of those masters of "retelling," Dr. Douglas Hyde and Dr. George Sigerson and Dr. John Todhunter, with whom should be mentioned the younger of the two editors of the "Treasury" himself: or, again, of the delicate, beautiful, and often powerful poetry of the Irishwomen who have added so much fragrance and music to that "dear Eden of our dreams, our Eiré"—Nora Hopper, Katharine Tynan, Dora Sigerson, Moira O'Neill, to mention only the four foremost, and these by the names by which they first became known. If we may judge by her "Songs of the Glens of Antrim," the latest comer, Moira O'Neill, should become one of the most noted of the Celtic group. Her verse is not so strong as Miss Sigerson's (Mrs. Clement Shorter's) at its strongest; nor as exquisitely deft and sunlit and tremulous as that of Katharine Tynan (Mrs. Hinkson) when best inspired, as always, by things pure, tender and by all young life; nor comparable with the penetrating and convincing art of Miss Nora Hopper when that fine poet trusts to her truest inspiration, and controls to a finer service a too facile spontaneity: but there is a quality in these "Songs of the Glens" which is all their own, a quality full of charm, and, what is more rare, distinction. The themes are always homely: the impression conveyed is invariably serene, because satisfying. I consider her "Corrymeela" the finest type of the modern Irish lyric, at once national, local and of a finished art. Moira O'Neill's "Corrymeela," Miss Nora Hopper's "King of Ireland's Son," and Mr. W. B. Yeats's "Isle of Innisfree" might well be advanced as three of the loveliest, as well as the most typical, lyrics of the Irish Muse in our present

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

day. Among the small group of Catholic poets, there is none who has a higher place than Mr. Lionel Johnson, whose "dæmon" is surely allied to that "Dark Angel" of whom he writes in memorable quatrains, in the sense at least of a controlling genius, sombre and austere. It is a pity that so remarkable a poet should be so inadequately represented as he is in this "Treasury." A kindred though distinct spirit is manifest in the poetry of Mr. Thomas Boyd, whose "Leanán Sidhe" I never read without a quickening pleasure, or without wonder that we have not more from his dreaming and potent imagination.

Of two other of the later poets it is almost needless to write. Mr. George Russell (better known as "A. E.") has published two little books of verse of a beauty so spiritual and poignant that they are, perhaps, even better known and loved now in the England for which he cares so little than in the Ireland to which he has given all the overflow of love and worship from that spiritual Ireland, "The Rose of the World." Of Mr. Yeats there is not as yet anything new to be said. He may not be, though I think he is, the finest artist now using verse as his means of beautiful revelation: there can be little question that his verse, at its best, is on a higher level of beauty than is that of any contemporary. Nevertheless, those of us who thus greatly value his work look beyond anything he has done. His two recent volumes, "The Wind in the Reeds" and "The Shadowy Waters," are intervals: the one where the poet has stopped to listen to an overcoming, fragmentary, aërial music, impossible wholly to capture, impossible for him, for a time, to ignore; the other where he has caught the echo of trampling feet and confused voices, the echo of the drama of life, whether that be the drama of mortal things and material life, or of spiritual things and immortal life. "The Wanderings of Oisín" should be the prelude to a Celtic epic to surpass "Congal" and all else that lies between us and the ancient Gaelic sagas, as "Countess Cathleen" should be a drama leading the way to drama that shall have all the beauty of "The Shadowy Waters," but a humanity as rich and deep and varied as characterizes that Gaelic world of Irish life which Mr. Yeats knows so well and can so well interpret.

There are omissions even in this conscientiously compiled anthology. Perhaps the most regrettable is that of Mr. Herbert Trench, a young Irish poet of exceptional promise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lyrics such as "She comes not when Noon is on the Roses," and "Come, Let us make Love Deathless," with its note of tragic beauty, and "Maurya's Song," show that the Irish Muse has a new follower whose name she may yet hold high. In the poem called "The Night," I find a stanza of that magic quality which alone suffices to prove the writer a poet, who has only to perfect his craft to become the rare artist also.

"But she, like sighing forests,
Stole on me—full of rest,
Her hair was like the sea's wave,
Whiteness was in her breast—"
(So does one come at night upon a wall of roses).

If it is from poets such as Mr. Yeats and Mr. George Russell, Miss Nora Hopper and Moira O'Neill, that we look for that which shall most reveal to us the beautiful Gaelic imagination, it will be well for both those who seek and those who sing to bear in mind the wise words of one of the greatest of Irishmen, Thomas Davis:

"Irish nationality must contain and represent all the races of Ireland. It must not be Celtic; it must not be Saxon; it must be Irish. The Brehon law, and the maxims of Westminster—the cloudy and the lightning genius of the Gael, the placid strength of the Sassenach, the marshalling insight of the Norman—a literature which shall exhibit in combination the passions and idioms of all, and which shall equally express our mind in its romantic, its religious, its forensic, and its practical tendencies; finally, a native government, which shall know and rule by the might and right of all, yet yield to the arrogance of none—these are the components of such a nationality."

There are many fine passages on nationality in the writings of Thomas Davis, but none so weighty with truth for those who would serve nobly the Irish Muse as these.

FIONA MACLEOD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SITUATION IN FINLAND.

BY FINLANDER.

Soon after the death of Alexander II., the reactionists obtained the predominating influence in the direction of Russia's home policy. The most influential man among these reactionists was Pobiedonostseff, Procurator-General of the Holy Synod and a member of the Committee of Ministers and of the State Council. Political freedom in his eyes is a most dangerous disease, which is ruining the Western nations. Only an autocratic power can protect its subjects against destructive agitations, and maintain order and discipline among them, to the benefit of all. The spread of knowledge among the masses only leads to misfortune. For the people, the Church should maintain a simple and uncritical belief in dogmas, wrapt in mystic obscurity.

The idea of Russifying all the heterogeneous races under the sceptre of the Tsar by force, was not raised to a maxim of government as long as any interest in a liberal policy of reform still remained alive. But as soon as the reactionary movement began to predominate, it allied itself with the Pan-Russian nationalist tendencies. The government systematically began to smother all manifestations of independent cultural development in the non-Russian nations within the Russian State.

The constitution of the Grand-Duchy of Finland had been solemnly and irrevocably confirmed on the union of the country with Russia in 1809. As Finland, in consequence, had its own legislation, its own government, its home policy, one was justified in assuming that the reactionary and nationalist tendency in Russia would not involve any danger for Finland.

During Alexander II.'s time, Finland had passed through a period of many-sided and intensive progress. In his capacity as Grand-Duke of Finland, the Emperor loyally took up his position

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the foundation of the Finnish Constitution. The organization of the Diet was reformed by a new fundamental law in 1869. Legislation in other directions was extensively developed. The self-government of the communes was adjusted to suit the requirements of the times. Liberty of industry took the place of the antiquated guild-system. The construction of a large system of railways was energetically begun. The gold standard was introduced; the state bank was reformed and placed under the supervision of the Diet; private credit establishments were instituted. Public education was emancipated from the control of the Church; the primary schools were thoroughly and practically organized. All this reforming activity was securely based upon the social order, founded on justice and freedom, that constituted an inheritance from the past centuries in which Finland had been a part of the Swedish State.

This precious inheritance, however, also had its dark side: the community with Swedish political life resulted in the Swedish language becoming the only official language and the language of higher education, although it was only spoken by a minority of the Finnish people. After the separation from Sweden, this had to be remedied. The Finnish language had to get the place due to it in political and intellectual life. The path was prepared by devoted work for the growth of the Finnish language and literature, and the foundation of this reform, too, had been laid during the reign of Alexander II.—according to the principle of equal rights, in point of language, for both the nationalities, Finnish and Swedish, that together make up the politically united people of Finland. Finally, it may be mentioned that the Finnish Diet, on Alexander II.'s proposition, passed a law in 1878 constituting universal service as the basis of the Finnish military system.

Alexander III., as Grand-Duke of Finland, followed the same policy as his father during the greater part of his reign. The Diet, which, according to the Law of 1869, is to assemble at least every five years, was convoked every third year. Thus, the joint work of the Government and the Representatives of the People was made easier. The Emperor Grand-Duke, accompanied by his noble-minded consort and his children, frequently visited Finland during the summer. On these journeys, the mode of life led by the Imperial Family was idyllic and free from all ceremony. The monarch had no need to fear those dangers that threatened him

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Russia. A simple and cordial homage was offered him by all classes of society.

But, in those circles of St. Petersburg and Moscow where the retrograde course in Russian policy was laid down, the picture of lawful order, civil liberty and cultured progress that Finland offered was regarded with hostile eyes. In 1881, the Russian press began a campaign, the object of which was to throw suspicion on the loyalty of the Finnish nation, and to create and disseminate the idea that the interests and honor of the Empire demanded the political and national amalgamation of Finland. The leaders of this campaign, which grew in vigor year by year, did not hesitate to employ any expedient to attain their object. Truth, justice and reason were scandalously set aside.

In any case, the claim ought to have been proved that respect for Finland's rights was in conflict with Russia's interests. Such proof has never been offered either by the press or in official documents. But incorrect statements were disseminated, false representations made, and passions stirred. It would lead too far here to quote examples of such biassed and untruthful assertions as were offered to the Russian public through the press in countless numbers. The chief statements which it was attempted to illustrate by means of forged anecdotes or distorted opinions were, that the educated classes in Finland were hostile to Russia, and that the leading Finnish politicians, especially those belonging to the Swedish party, were *Separatists*. The charge of separatism was the one which was most eagerly employed to serve the purpose. It was useless trying to refute such allegations by pointing to the fact that no political party in Finland has ever expressed opinions of a separatist nature. The imputations continued, and the public were finally led to believe that there was some foundation for them.

The first *official* utterances of the policy of amalgamation appeared in 1889. Alexander III. had been persuaded that it was incompatible with Russia's interests for Finland to have a separate system of customs, a separate coinage, and a separate postal establishment; *unity* ought to be effected in these concerns. Committees of Russians and Finns were established to make proposals for such a unification. The Finnish members demonstrated the impossibility of unifying the Finnish monetary system, in which only gold coins are legal tender, and the Russian system of credit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

notes, which are not redeemable in metallic currency. It was also proved that the Russian customs tariff was quite unsuitable to Finland, and that the continuance of the customs-frontier between the two countries was necessary even from the point of view of Russia's financial interests, while the excise dues on corn-brandy, beer and tobacco could not be worked in common. The proposals for the unification of coinage and customs fell through. But in June, 1890, a manifesto was issued that decreed that the management of the Finnish postal system should be centred in the Home Office of the Empire. This was opposed to the Constitution of Finland, according to which all State institutions must be subject to the Finnish government. Another violation of the fundamental law occurred in 1891, when it was ordained that the posts of officials at the Finnish Secretariate of State at St. Petersburg, and at the Governor-General's Secretary's office at Helsingfors, were to be filled, not only by Finns, but also by Russians.

Finland's Constitution is not summed up in a single fundamental law or charter. It is contained in two chief laws: the Form of Government, and the law on the organization of the representation of the people. The last named was reformed by means of a fundamental law promulgated in 1869, called the "Law of the Diet." The Form of Government of 1772 had, in the course of time, been altered in certain respects by partial legislative measures. To remodel that part of the Constitution by means of a codification was of importance for giving its interpretation perfect clearness. By order of the Emperor, a scheme for a codified fundamental law was drawn up by the Finnish Senate and submitted to the Emperor in 1891, with the request that it might be referred to the Diet for examination.

There was, therefore, absolutely no question here of political reforms that could affect the power of the monarch, nor of any change in the relation of the Grand-Duchy towards the Empire, but only of a *formal* remodelling of the above-mentioned part of the Finnish Constitution. Nevertheless, Russian statesmen of the anti-Finnish party set about meddling in the matter. They feared lest the political position of Finland should gain increased clearness and firmness if the new fundamental law were passed. And it was therefore so arranged that the Emperor entrusted a committee of Russian and Finnish statesmen with the examination of the Senate's proposal, before taking it up himself for consideration.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The five Russian members of this committee succeeded in carrying their point against the four Finnish members, *i. e.*, that the committee should not enter into an examination of the Senate's proposal, but should first take up an entirely new question for discussion, namely, the establishment of a new plan for the issuing of laws common to the Empire and the Grand-Duchy in all matters affecting the interests of the two countries. The Russian State-Council was to be the organ that should definitely prepare such legislative matters as were to be submitted to the Emperor's decision. The Finnish members of the committee protested against this proposal, and pointed out that a plan of this sort, that encroached upon the rights of the Finnish Diet, could in no case be carried through without the consent of the Diet. When the proposal for this common legislation was laid before Alexander III., in March, 1893, he appears to have attached importance to this protest, for he resolved that the proposal should not be debated in the Russian State-Council without his special command. But the question of codifying the Form of Government was *also* laid aside at the same time. Early in 1894 the Diet issued an address to the monarch, expressing the firm hope that no legislative steps resulting from the proposals of the majority of the said committee should be taken without due reference to the Diet.

It is probable that this utterance increased the Emperor's scruples about the proposal, and that, before his death, he had himself mentioned these misgivings to his son, the heir-apparent; because, when, in 1895, de Plehve requested the Emperor Nicholas II.'s permission to discuss the matter in council, the latter answered that he did not consider the proposed plan expedient.

When this reply of the Emperor became known in political circles in Finland, it awakened great satisfaction, since by it he had rejected an insidious attempt to undermine the constitutional legislative order in Finland. No fresh threatening clouds appeared on the horizon during the early years of his reign. The Diet met for the first time after his accession in January, 1897. In his speech from the throne, Nicholas II. said among other things: "It is with the greatest satisfaction that I express to you, as representatives of all the Estates of the Finnish people, my gratitude for the staunch fidelity and devotion which this people has always shown to its sovereigns."

But the Pobiedonostseff party continued to brood over the plan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of annihilating Finnish internal independence. An attempt was made, in the first place, to prevent the Imperial couple's journey to Helsingfors, and to instil suspicion into the Emperor's mind as to the loyalty of the Finns. What means were used for this purpose, is only partly known. These intrigues consisted in part of libels against Finnish statesmen, and in part of misrepresentations of the legal questions with regard to Finland's political position. To this were added fine speeches about the Emperor's august mission with respect to the unity of the Empire, from a constitutional as well as a linguistic and national point of view.

By the provisions of the Finnish Military Service act, it appertained to the Russian Minister of War to take cognizance of, and to report to the monarch upon, such matters affecting the Finnish army as did not relate to legislation or to the command of the troops. These last-named matters fell within the province of the Finnish Senate, and were to be reported to the monarch by the Secretary of State for Finland, after the Minister of War had stated his views. In spite of this, proposals as to new laws relating to the Finnish army had been planned at the Russian Ministry of War. Kuropatkin, then Minister of War, prevailed upon the Emperor to summon the Finnish Diet to an extraordinary session in January, 1899, to deal with the so-called "military reform."

The "reform" consisted chiefly in the dissolution of the Finnish army, with the exception of the Guard, the introduction of regulations for military service similar to the Russian, the obligation imposed on the young men of Finland to serve in the Russian ranks. In the proposition to the Diet, it was declared that this change was required by the necessity for unifying the army of the Empire. The reason assigned was but an empty phrase, for the Finnish troops were organized, trained and armed on the same system as the Russian. The real aim of the reform was to make a breach in the institutions of Finland, and to Russify the Finnish youth by means of a military service of several years in Russia.

General Bobrikoff was appointed Governor-General of Finland in the autumn of 1898. He and de Plehve now hit upon the idea of dispensing with the consent of the Diet to the reform. The proposal for common legislation between Russia and Finland, which had been lying since 1893 in the archives of the Russian State-Council, was brought out of its pigeon-hole. The Emperor's frame of mind was no longer the same as formerly. He permitted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a summoning of a secret committee that was to hurry on the final draft of the said proposal. And, on the 15th of February (new style), 1899, a manifesto was issued containing "fundamental statutes for the preparation, revision, and promulgation of laws issued for the Empire, including the Grand-Duchy of Finland."

In the secret committee which drew up the manifesto, legal science was represented by Pobiedonostseff, by the Minister of Justice, by the President of the Law Department in the State Council, and by the Secretary of the Empire, de Plehve. It is surprising that these lawyers did not understand that the Finnish legislative powers, which are organized according to constitutional principles, cannot be brought into cooperation or collaboration with the autocratic legislative power of the Empire. They ought also to have understood that an alteration in Finland's fundamental law, of such a nature that the monarch alone should be empowered to decide upon legal questions, would be a legal nullity, since it was to take place without the consent of the Diet.

Dismay and indignation were aroused everywhere in Finland when the manifesto of February 15th, 1899, was issued. The Senate and the Diet immediately sent a deputation to St. Petersburg, to present to the Emperor a memorial in which the incompatibility of the manifesto with the fundamental laws of Finland was emphasized, and it was requested that such measures might be taken as would render the country secure from any unconstitutional application of the manifesto. The deputation was not received. Citizens from all parts of the country, to the number of 530,000, signed an address to the monarch, expressing the sorrow and anxiety of the people as to the manifesto, and begging that the country's fundamental laws might be respected. The address was sent to St. Petersburg with a deputation of 500 representatives of the different parishes. The deputation was not received.

Meantime, the Diet went on with the examination of the military scheme. They found it impossible to approve of it. The representatives of the Finnish people could not cooperate in the establishment of a law that was to change military service into a punishment of exile for the youth of Finland.

The Diet, when it declined the proposal made by the Russian War Office, resolved to alter the Military Service Bill of 1878 in certain parts, so as to bring it more into conformity with the Russian system, and to increase the country's sacrifices for defence

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by doubling the active army on a peace footing. And the Judicial Committee of the Diet drew up a detailed judicial exposition to show that the February manifesto was opposed to the Constitution.

In the address to the monarch, in which the military proposals were replied to, the Diet declared *inter alia:*

"That the manifesto of February 15th, 1899, having been issued in a form differing from that prescribed by the fundamental law, could not have the sanctity of law;

"that no law concerning military service for the inhabitants of Finland can be issued, unless it has been accepted by the Diet, without violating the Finnish Constitution; and

"that the Diet consider it their duty, based upon the highest considerations, to hold fast to the law and the right, which in the year 1809 were solemnly guaranteed to the Finnish people to be irrevocably maintained."

The period of conflict had set in all over Finland. It was and it is not only a conflict between the monarch, who oversteps the constitutional limits of his powers, and the people and its representatives, who endeavor to defend the law. It is a conflict between the Russian power, that illegally and destructively intervenes in the political life of Finland, and the Finnish nation in its entirety fighting for its existence. It is, moreover, a conflict between Eastern despotism and Western principles of justice and love for law-abiding freedom.

But were there then no real reasons, no needs founded upon experience, which required such common legislation as was prescribed in the manifesto?

No; even from a practical point of view such legislative procedure is quite unnecessary. Ever since Finland's union with Russia, a number of questions referring to both countries' mutual interests have been settled in such a way that the proper Russian and Finnish authorities, by means of negotiations, have agreed on the necessary legislative measures, which have been issued in both countries after receiving the monarch's consent. The questions have thus been regulated according to the principles of reciprocity.

After the military question had been dealt with by the Diet, it was, in accordance with the February manifesto, submitted to the Russian State Council. This was at variance with the universal rule, according to which laws have no retroactive effect, least of all laws affecting procedure. As a matter of fact, the military bill, which was already being dealt with by the Diet when the mani-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

festo appeared, had been prepared in a different way from that prescribed by the manifesto. In the Russian Council of State, the majority had expressed themselves *against* the War Minister's bill, and acknowledged the Diet's principal objections as justified. Then Kuropatkin, Bobrikoff and de Plehve formed an extraordinary committee, which modified certain parts of the bill prepared by the Diet and the Russian State-Council, and procured the Emperor's sanction to the law which these gentlemen wished to issue. Of course no attention was paid to the Diet's decision. Arbitrariness triumphed.

And this is the only time that the manifesto has been applied. The reason of this is simply that no such questions have arisen as could possibly require joint legislation.

But, one may ask, as the February manifesto has not been applied since then, has it really been such a peril for the Finnish Constitution?

It has been and it is a peril, because the Russian reactionists have considered it to be an official authorization of their endeavor to encroach upon Finland's rights.

The reactionary camarilla succeeded in the autumn of 1889 in getting the Secretary of the Empire, de Plehve, nominated as Secretary of State for Finland. He did not scruple in the least to accept this post, although he knew that his nomination was a breach of Finland's fundamental law. The report of Finnish matters of State was thus entrusted to a man who was not only entirely unacquainted with Finland's laws and national life, but moreover ill-disposed towards the country.

It was declared in the February manifesto that the joint legislation should embrace such laws as touched the interests of both Russia and Finland. Further the manifesto contained the explicit statement that laws relating exclusively to the internal affairs of Finland should continue to be made in accordance with the statutes hitherto in force in the Grand-Duchy. But de Plehve pointed out to the Emperor in a written memorial that the Russian Autocrat's power can in no wise be bound by the laws of conquered Finland. After having gained a willing ear to this doctrine, which with justice has been characterized as "juridical nihilism," he was free, together with his confederate Bobrikoff, to set about the ruin of Finland's institutions.

In June, 1900, an Imperial Manifesto was issued which enacted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that Russian should be the official language of Finland in the higher administration of affairs, instead of the national languages, Finnish and Swedish. This was a violation both of the fundamental law and of the people's national rights. How absurd this was, moreover, from a practical point of view, will be easily understood if one considers that, out of Finland's 2,800,000 inhabitants, only 7,000 speak Russian as their mother tongue. In order to be able to fulfil the provisions of the manifesto, capable officials, who do not know Russian, must be replaced by persons chosen from amongst the small number who have succeeded in learning some Russian, but who are otherwise unqualified for the positions in question. It has now been prescribed that instruction in Russian should be compulsory in the schools.

With respect to the anti-constitutional military law, published in July, 1901, the purpose was not to reform the military system, but to Russify the conscripts. What impression this autocratic measure made was immediately seen by the fact that half a million citizens, in an address to the monarch, declared that the Finnish people could not recognize this law, issued without the consent of the Diet, as valid, and that no one was obliged to conform to it. On account of that, the government have not yet dared to enforce it: hitherto, no recruits have been drafted into the Russian ranks. The authorities have been content so far to summon only those, about 200 in number, who are necessary for filling up the ranks of the Finnish Guard, out of the 25,000 young men who are to be called out annually. This conscription comedy, repeated annually since 1902, has, however, had its deeply tragical side. A number of loyal officials have been dismissed because they refused to assist in carrying out this illegal military decree. Thousands of the conscripts have, for the same reason, refused to let themselves be enrolled, and are therefore suffering various kinds of punishment or persecution.

The organization of the Finnish government has been ruined by transferring to the Governor-General important parts of the right of decision which, according to the principles of the Constitution, ought to belong to the Senate, the incorporated Board of Government. Every prominent and independent man has been removed from the Senate. The Emperor has appointed as their successors such persons as Bobrikoff has recommended.

The independence of the courts of justice was safeguarded by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the irremovability of the judges. This irremovability has been abolished. All the functionaries who have remained faithful to the Constitution have been removed from their posts.

Contrary to the fundamental law, it has been decreed that Russians should be admitted to all employments in Finland. It is no longer even required that they should have any knowledge of the laws of Finland or of the Swedish or Finnish languages. In all government offices where Russians have been appointed, the good order that prevailed before has been disturbed.

According to law, every private citizen had a right to prosecute in a court of law any official who, as such, had violated his rights or done him any injury. This important legal guarantee has been abolished, inasmuch as now the permission of the Governor-General or of other superior authority is required before one is allowed to prosecute an official. The right to form societies for purposes of general utility has been subjected to arbitrary restrictions. The right to discuss matters of public interest at meetings has been made dependent on the permission of the police authorities. The censorship of printed matter which was formerly exercised with liberality has been preposterously aggravated.

The police in Finland used to be a well-regulated, loyal body, which performed its duties conscientiously in the service of order and justice. Now it is a demoralized instrument for political persecutions. The police budget has been largely increased. Moreover, the country has been favored with a strong body of Russian gendarmes, which, for a yearly consideration of 680,000 marks out of the Finnish Treasury, practises espionage and commits acts of violence against peaceful citizens.

The Finns are not an irritable people. Calmness and deliberation, patience and resignation are among their characteristic traits. But to submit without resistance to a tyrannical régime, which cynically tramples on law and justice, would be tantamount to acquiescing in one's own debasement. Resistance was necessary. The prevailing opinion in the matter may be expressed in these sentences: "It is our duty to endeavor to safeguard the laws of the land. In so doing, we must ourselves abide by the principles of law. In resisting tyranny, we must not make use of other than lawful means." In conformity with this, Finnish opposition has expressed itself principally in the refusal, not only of officials, but also of private citizens, to execute ordinances and edicts that are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opposed to the fundamental law or to other laws,—and, in the devoted work of upholding and spreading within the country the love of, and loyalty to, its Constitution. It is easy to see what difficulties this work has encountered, for all public discussion is suppressed. The difficulties have been added to by the existence of a government party, led by such Finns as have considered it to be the wisest policy to yield to the demands of might, in the hope that the monarch might some day change his sentiments, and give Finland back her rights.

Bobrikoff did not understand that ideas are a power that cannot be forcibly coerced. He wanted to put an end to all opposition. He and de Plehve had held out to the Emperor the prospect, that the inoffensive Finnish people would very soon yield to His Majesty's gracious will,—for it would, forsooth, be an honor for this little nation to be amalgamated with the great Russian State, and to come under the control of the mighty autocracy! In order that absolute quiet might soon reign in the country, the only thing necessary was vigorously to check the agitation that was still being carried on by "evil-minded" persons. For this purpose the Governor-General ought to be invested with the unlimited powers of a Dictator. The Emperor agreed to this in a statute of April 3rd, 1903, "as to measures for the maintenance of order in the State and of public peace." It was clear to everybody that this statute ought properly to have been headed a statute "to empower the Governor-General further to disturb order in the State and the public peace by means of the illegal persecution of any one who opposes the revolutionary policy of the Government."

This statute empowered Bobrikoff to make the inhabitants of Finland more intimately acquainted with the fully developed police tyranny as practised in Russia. He interfered with the independence of the Communes by dismissing functionaries elected by them, who had been reported as being faithful to the laws. He sent his gendarmes to force their way into the houses of prominent men, in order to examine, seize, and carry off their papers and books. He got the police to imprison and brutally ill-treat innocent persons with an arbitrariness that had no limits. He exiled about fifty honored citizens for no other reason than that they were looked upon as being disposed to favor the opposition. Bobrikoff's violent goings-on and widespread espionage increased the difficulties of opposition, of course; but it also intensified the ill-feel-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing and the hatred against those in power. The wounded sense of justice found expression, in the spring of 1904, in mass-meetings of working-people, whose resolutions culminated in the cry, "Down with autocracy, down with Bobrikoff, Plehve, and the Senators"! On June 16th, a young Finnish nobleman discharged his revolver against Bobrikoff. It was the deed of a single person. He at once destroyed himself. He therefore cannot give us a description of the struggles of his soul, and the despair which drove him to take vengeance on the oppressor of his country. And yet even those who maintain that the law is never to be set aside, and who deprecate the political murder, find it hard to judge harshly a deed, the victim of which had so ruthlessly injured the rights of Finland and the vital interests of its people.

If now the question be raised whether Russia has derived advantage and benefit from this new policy which has been so destructive to Finland, the answer cannot be other than decidedly negative. The bond of union has not been strengthened, since the moral factors, respect and trust, without which no political union can have solidity, are destroyed when one of the members illegally and oppressively interferes with the existence of the other. The policy of Russification can attain no other result than a continual irritation, for Finland's people no longer stands on such a low level of culture that it can be denationalized. Russia's economic interests suffer injury when the disturbance of legal order in Finland hinders the economic progress of the country, and thus reduces the sale of Russian products there. And, last but not least, the reputation of the Russian Government has been severely damaged abroad by this policy of violence against Finland. The official world of St. Petersburg has feigned indifference to the severe judgment passed everywhere upon its policy. But, at heart, it has been very painfully impressed by it none the less.

Since it has become known in Finland, during these last years, of what nature the forces are which, under the ægis of autocracy, drive the political machinery in St. Petersburg, we cannot hope for a satisfactory solution of the conflict until an entire change of system has been carried out in Russia. When a method of government, founded on justice, has there taken the place of the arbitrary exercise of power, then Finland may count on due respect being meted out to its Constitution.

FINLANDER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: BERLIN: ST. PETERSBURG: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *November, 1904.*

THE apathy which, except in its closing hours, appeared to mark the public attitude toward the Presidential election even in America amounted in England to something little short of sheer indifference. For this there were several obvious reasons. The campaign, for one thing, seemed to us on this side of the Atlantic singularly unspectacular and, in a sense, singularly unreal. Compared with the elections of 1896 and 1900, it struck Englishmen as lacking both in personal picturesqueness and in public interest. Had Mr. Roosevelt followed Mr. Bryan's example and stumped the country, had Mr. Parker made his oratorical effort six weeks instead of two weeks before polling-day, the contest would have been followed over here with real avidity. As it was, the campaign made next to no appeal to that dramatic sense which every American election is expected to excite. We hoped a good deal from Mr. Parker after his telegram to the St. Louis Convention. It revealed a man where we had suspected nothing but an enigma, and we settled ourselves comfortably in our seats with the expectation of assisting at a vigorous and closely fought struggle. But the aftermath was a disappointment. So far as we could see, Mr. Parker did not improve on his position, as he might and should have done. He won, indeed, and never lost, the respect of all English onlookers as a man of courage, independence and scrupulous regard for the dignities and proprieties of judicial and political life. But until the final moments of the contest, his campaign appeared to lack aggressiveness and decision, and the impression made by his personality grew fainter and fainter. Nor could we see that any issues of public moment either to America or to the world came to the front. The differences between the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two parties, when there were any differences at all, never seemed to amount to more than differences of argument and theory.

Moreover, no British interest was involved in the campaign. In 1896, our concern in the preservation of the gold standard was second only to America's. In 1900, for political as well as sentimental reasons, we could not be indifferent to whatever decision the American people might come to on the general question of Imperialism. Moreover, we had four years ago the eloquence of the American pro-Boers to keep us interested. But this year neither the conduct of the campaign, nor its issue, touched us in any tangible way.

As a nation, we were for once free from the temptation to take sides in American politics. As a nation, we had no preference for Mr. Roosevelt over Mr. Parker or for Mr. Parker over Mr. Roosevelt. As individuals, we could not help having our predilections. Mr. Roosevelt we admire. His character and career, his intense virility and decisiveness in office, have made a deep and genuine impression on British opinion. In his policy we have found much to applaud and little, if anything, to quarrel with; he has seemed to us to rank with the most high-minded and efficient Presidents that America has yet produced. On personal grounds, therefore, and without having anything whatever against Mr. Parker, most Englishmen hoped to see Mr. Roosevelt elected. But they would not have been in the least disconcerted by Mr. Parker's success. On the contrary, they would for some reasons have welcomed it. Those who in this country follow American affairs closely and with knowledge—and, happily, they are growing more numerous every year—have for some time been anxious to rescue Great Britain from the suspicion of being better disposed towards the Republicans than towards the Democrats. It is perfectly true that, for the past decade, we in England have found ourselves more in sympathy with the former party than with the latter. The Republicans preserved the gold standard. It was under a Republican Administration that the United States entered on that course of Imperialism and of international activity which has the heartiest good wishes of the British people. The enormous improvement in Anglo-American relations which the last few years have witnessed has coincided with the presence in Washington of Republican Presidents and Republican Secretaries of State. Moreover, the memory of Mr. Cleveland's Vene-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

zuelan message and the irruption of Bryanism have served still further to widen the gulf between England and the Democratic party. In the judgment of Englishmen that party is still tainted with the spirit of Anti-Imperalism and among the rank and file Anglophobia, though only in a passive form, is thought still to obtain. But while Englishmen believe this, they believe also that immediate contact with realities, such as office alone can give, would work a wondrous change in the Democratic attitude. It would make clear to them how thin and sentimental has been their objection to Imperialism, and how impossible it is for them to continue much longer evading the responsibilities of America's new position; and, above all, it would reveal to them that Great Britain is not the friend of this party or of that, but of America as a whole.

It has been a common complaint for years among Americans that Englishmen do not take the trouble to inform themselves on American affairs. I will not say that the accusation, once but too justifiable, has lost all its basis. But I will say that it is rapidly losing it. If Americans will glance over the leading English papers for the past few months, they will, I think, agree that the discussion of the Presidential election has on the whole showed remarkable perseverance, thoroughness and accuracy. I doubt whether they will be able to claim that any General Election in Great Britain has ever been discussed by the American press more fully or with greater knowledge. Some mistakes, of course, there have been, nor, considering the appalling complexities of American politics, could they well have been avoided. But almost without exception they have been mistakes of detail. The general situation and the principal issues have been well grasped and most ably expounded. The days, indeed, have completely gone by when Englishmen were content to remain in ignorance of American affairs. Every paper now seems to have its own American correspondent, and the superstition that New York is the pivot of American life and the only real source of American news, has been outgrown. In the November issues of the great monthly reviews which so admirably instruct British opinion, there appeared no less than eight or nine articles dealing with the personal and political aspects of the late Presidential election. The new interest in all things American, which has sprung up so suddenly all over Europe in the past few years, is nowhere more pervasive

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or better informed than in England. This is precisely as it should be. There is no country with which Englishmen feel themselves in closer touch and sympathy. The Anglo-American Arbitration Treaty, which is now being negotiated, is not needed if the intention of its framers is to emphasize the cordiality of Anglo-American relations. Those relations have at length reached a stage where any public manifestation of the ties that unite the two countries is superfluous; and such value as the new Arbitration Treaty, if and when ratified, may be expected to possess will be general rather than specific, a contribution to civilization at large rather than an addition of any peculiar importance to the stock of Anglo-American good-will.

It is impossible for an Englishman to touch, however briefly, on Anglo-American relations without thinking of the accomplished lawyer, speaker and diplomat whose good fortune it has been to preside over and to further their improvement. I mean, of course, Mr. Choate. Mr. Choate has now served a longer term as Ambassador to the Court of St. James's than any of his predecessors since the retirement, thirty-five years ago, of Mr. Charles Francis Adams. To mark the occasion the American colony in London has decided to present him, at the annual Thanksgiving-day dinner, with a portrait of himself, painted by Mr. Herkomer, and to place a replica of the portrait in the offices of the Embassy. It is a wholly American affair, the subscribers being restricted to "Americans residing or having interests in England." But though English subscriptions have — very properly, from the standpoint of diplomatic etiquette—been ruled out, there has been nothing to prevent Englishmen from showing their interest in the presentation or their regard for its recipient. I have nowhere seen this interest and regard better or more accurately reproduced than in a recent editorial in the "Morning Post." "Mr. Choate came to us," says this admirable journal, "with a great reputation as a lawyer, a wit, and a brilliantly effective fighter for the purity and freedom of American politics. He has now, in a larger sphere, added immeasurably to his titles to fame by proving himself one of the most popular and capable of diplomatists and a potent and untiring instrument of Anglo-American good-will." After describing the multitudinous demands that are made upon an American Ambassador by society, by literary, philosophical, political, educational institutions and by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

English passion for after-dinner oratory, the "Morning Post" winds up:

"To all these demands and many others Mr. Choate has responded with unwearying kindness and unfailing aptitude. No serious question has arisen between the two countries during his term of office; none need arise during the many years that we still hope to have him with us. . . . But the days have happily gone when the worth of an American Ambassador in London or of a British Ambassador in Washington need be gauged by the standards of merely 'diplomatic' achievements. The social side of both high offices now competes with, if it does not overshadow, their official and diplomatic side, and it is by mingling freely in the life of the nations to which they are accredited that British and American Ambassadors really do their best work in bringing the two countries together. No one whom America has ever sent us has been better qualified than Mr. Choate by temperament, intellectual equipment, and complete mastery of all the arts of social success, to make the most and the best of such conditions. He has established himself as a universal favorite, for his own sake as well as for the sake of the country he comes from; and the presentation which his countrymen in Great Britain are to make him carries with it the affectionate esteem of the entire British people."

Since my last letter England has been nearer to war with Russia than she ever was with France over Fashoda. When the news of the North Sea outrage reached England, two days after it had occurred, the first sensation of the country was one of sheer amazement. As the details poured in, amazement passed into burning indignation, but for fully twenty-four hours afterwards no one, I think, considered it possible that war could be its outcome. The very enormity of the crime seemed in a way to be a guarantee of peace. But when the days passed by and nothing was received from St. Petersburg, except a telegram from the Tsar to the King, which English opinion certainly undervalued, it was quickly realized that war might, after all, be only a question of hours. Men of every shade of political thought rallied instantaneously behind the Government. The Government, almost for the first time in its history, became really representative of the entire country. Opinion concentrated with remarkable speed on four demands—(1) that apologies should be exacted, (2) that prompt and adequate compensation should be made, (3) that those guilty of the outrage should be punished, and (4) that satisfactory guarantees should be forthcoming against the repetition of any such criminal blunder. From one end of Great Britain to the other you would not have found two opinions on the necessity of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

making these demands and, if need were, of enforcing them. For three whole days it appeared all but inevitable that they would have to be enforced. When the Russian press began talking as though Admiral Rozhdestvensky had acted in self-defence and as though the fishermen were to blame; when, in particular, the Admiral's own amazing version of the affair came to be circulated; then, indeed, English opinion, outwardly calm and restrained, grew undoubtedly bloodthirsty. The Government did not prepare for war; there was no necessity to; the game was entirely in our hands, and nothing more was needed than the precaution of arranging the concentration or rather the cooperation of the Home, Channel, and Mediterranean fleets. Not a ship was put in commission; it was simply a question of disposing of those already on service to the best advantage. But the activity at the dockyards naturally did nothing to diminish the expectation of war. Even within a few hours of the Russian agreement to the British demands, the bulk of opinion, so far as I could gauge it, inclined to the view that war would come. Popular interest reached an unprecedented height. At the decisive stage of the crisis, the manager of one of the great London daily journals told me that he had spent most of the morning answering prepaid telegrams from all over the country from people he had never seen or heard of, asking for the latest news. In all his experience, which goes back over forty years, he had never known anything like it. It speaks well for English self-possession that public feeling only once got out of hand. That was when the Russian Ambassador, hurrying back to town from the Continent, was "booed" on his arrival in London. Otherwise, the calm of the country might have deceived, and in fact did deceive, those who were not well versed in the national psychology. The relief which greeted Mr. Balfour's announcement of the settlement was the only outward token of the tensity of popular emotion. I will not say that the settlement pleases everybody. There were and are a few who think it insufficient, and whom nothing would have satisfied but the forced return of the Baltic fleet to Cronstadt. But now that its terms are fully known, now that negotiations for putting it into effect are progressing smoothly, the country as a whole is well pleased. The only feature of the British case which might have been omitted was Mr. Balfour's brilliantly scathing analysis of the Russian Admiral's "explanations"—an analysis which was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in effect an attack upon the rectitude of that remarkable seaman. It should have been omitted, not merely because his conduct was *sub judice,* but because it gave the impression that the Admiral himself would be held for examination. When he sailed from Vigo a few days later, leaving behind only four subordinates to represent the Russian case before the Court of Inquiry, it had all the effect of an English diplomatic defeat.

The Anglo-Russian crisis has rather crowded out the Fiscal issue, and the meeting of Conservative Associations at Southampton at the end of October, instead of being engrossed with the tariff question and the relations between Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain, was overshadowed by the cloud of war. Nevertheless, the meeting passed resolutions that endorsed all in Mr. Balfour's programme that is acceptable to the Chamberlainites and passed over the remainder in silence. It did nothing to elucidate the quantity or the quality of the Prime Minister's sympathy with his ex-Colonial Secretary's propaganda, but it proved pretty conclusively that the Conservative party is once more a party of Protection and unwilling to call a halt even at the half-way house of Retaliation. That is significant, even if it leaves the question of whether Mr. Balfour is for Mr. Chamberlain or against him as much an open question as ever. Another significant development in the fiscal campaign has been the candidature of Sir John Cockburn for the seat rendered vacant by the death of Sir William Harcourt. Sir John Cockburn is a Colonial, an Australian I believe, who for some years represented his Colony in London as its Agent-General. He was put up by the Chamberlainites as a special spokesman of Colonial opinion, and the local Conservatives adopted him as their candidate with effusion. Like almost all Colonials, Sir John is an intense Radical. There was not a single point of sympathy between himself and his Conservative supporters, except his advocacy of Tariff reform. On the Licensing question, the Education question, the Church Disestablishment question, the Payment of Members question, Home Rule and the Land question, he was utterly opposed to the party for which he was standing. "The interesting experiment," as "The Times" called it, ended in a smashing defeat. So, it is to be hoped, for the honesty of English politics, such experiments will always end. Yet a third incident, not less noteworthy, has been the purchase of "The Standard" by Mr. C. A. Pearson, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chairman of the Tariff Reform League. "The Standard" has vastly improved its position within the last eighteen months by refusing to bow the knee to Mr. Chamberlain, and by its unflinching advocacy of Free Trade from the Unionist standpoint. It spoke in a special sense for such men as the Duke of Devonshire, Mr. Ritchie, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, Lord George Hamilton, and Lord Hugh Cecil. Its capture by the Chamberlainites now leaves London with only one penny paper—and that one an evening paper, the "Westminster Gazette"—to uphold the Free-Trade cause. If one were so foolish or so innocent as to regard London as synonymous with England, and the opinion of the London press as representative of English opinion, the conclusion could hardly be avoided that the return to Protection is assured. But every one who really knows England would at once deny both the premises and the inference drawn from them.

BERLIN, *November, 1904.*

ADMIRAL ROZHDESTVENSKY'S night attack upon defenceless fishermen engaged in the peaceful pursuit of their calling seems to have touched the pulse of outraged humanity throughout the civilized world. With one voice the press of Central Europe, saturated with Anglophobia, and accustomed, as it is, to Russian methods of barbarism, and to political subserviency to that country, branded the execrable outrage off the Dogger Bank as one of the most savage, inexcusable, and unpardonable blunders ever committed on the high seas. People on the Continent were literally astounded at the evasive conduct of the Admiral, who even after the slaughter on that fatal night might still have made honorable amends by putting into Dover, or some other English port, to offer apologies and reparation, but who chose with his rabble crews to make off like a thief in the dark without even deeming it necessary to report the matter to his own Government; at the cynical indifference of the man for human life, for the elementary principles of international comity, common decency and honor; at his mendacity, patent and glaring in every line of his crazy and craven "explanation," extracted from him only at the urgent solicitations of his own Government, which, in turn, was moved to act only through fear that failure to explain and apologize would involve the nation in immediate hostilities. And so, when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the crisis came, all Europe was prepared to hear that the British Navy had been entrusted with the task of exacting retribution. Nevertheless, the peaceful solution of the difficulty was universally welcomed with unfeigned feelings of relief, in which Germany sincerely participated. The tact, patience and diplomatic bearing of the British Government in circumstances of exceptional provocation were not only admitted, but even warmly praised, by the whole Continental press. The announcement that the Russian fleet was to remain at Vigo until the finding of the international Court of inquiry, was acclaimed generally as a great moral victory for England; who, it was contended, by her firm example of forbearance and clemency, had not only established a magnificent precedent for arbitration on all future occasions of strife between nations, but had served the interests of civilization in a highly remarkable manner. All felt that England, with her mighty navy, could have destroyed the Russian fleet in a few hours had the Government so willed it, and all felt that it was only due to the imposing display of naval power that Russia yielded, or compromised, at all. With the feeling of relief that war had been avoided came the feeling of satisfaction that so dangerous a man as the Russian Admiral, who, on his own showing, shot blindly at all craft venturing within his zone of fire, was to be brought to trial to answer for his crime; came, too, gratitude and respect for England's "triumph."

Now all has changed. The departure of the Russian fleet from Vigo created a feeling on the whole Continent of stupefaction and disappointment. Everybody believes that England has once more allowed herself to be duped by Russia, and has made herself rather ridiculous by meekly giving way after so pompous a display of naval power, press rhetoric and beating of drums. The Continent had been led to understand from Mr. Balfour's own words that a portion, at any rate, of the Russian fleet was to be detained at Vigo until redress had been given, and the guilty parties—in this case admittedly the Admiral himself—had been punished, and in that belief had welcomed the solution. But now that the Russian fleet, still under the command of the infamous Admiral, has left Spanish waters, leaving behind as hostages, or scapegoats, four (probably perfectly innocent) subalterns, everybody is asking the pertinent question what all the pother has been about, if that is to be all. Was it for this that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the whole British Navy was mobilized, and the world threatened with war? Would it not have been more dignified to have talked less and done more? And so the foreign press is casting ridicule upon Great Britain. By standing manfully up to Russia England would have re-established her prestige in the eyes of all Europe; as it is, Mr. Balfour, finding that without fighting he could obtain nothing more from Russia, put his pride in his pocket, and decided for peace. Chinese mandarins cut off the heads of a few minor officials when their own heads are in jeopardy, and as life is cheap in Russia some scapegoat, doubtless, will be found; for nobody now believes that condign punishment will ever be meted out to any of the culprits, whatever the finding of the Court may be, and however forcibly represented.

Politically viewed, as in England so on the Continent, opinions vary as to the ultimate wisdom of a peaceful solution. The Socialists are profoundly disappointed that England did not complete the *débâcle* of Russian arms by destroying the Russian navy, and, together with victorious Japan, hasten the advent of progress and reform in the internal administration of Russia. Nor are there serious political voices lacking who maintain that England has thrown away a golden opportunity, that may never occur again, of crushing an enemy with whom she never can live on terms of friendship, and who now, humiliated but not humbled, will abide her time, until, like a wounded panther, she can spring at the throat of her foe.

Meanwhile the personal alliance between the German and the Russian Emperors is growing more and more apparent, and has recently received signal demonstration. By order of the Tsar and the German Emperor, the old arrangement existing in the days when Germany was reinsured to Russia has been renewed—whereby the German military attaché in St. Petersburg and the Russian military attaché in Berlin have been attached to the personal military suites of the Emperors to whose Courts they are respectively accredited. This shows the complete confidence placed by the Russian military authorities in Germany's "benevolent neutrality," and is the first public manifestation of the existence of that alliance between the two Governments which the German semi-official organs have been so zealous in denying. It is no exaggeration to say that it opens a new era in the relations between Germany and Russia, cementing the solidarity of the East

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Europe as opposed to the West, against which, too, it is directed. Nor have Admiral Rozhdestvensky's numerous outrages upon the high seas failed to accentuate that fact. On the one hand, we find France inwardly chafing at the brutal folly of her ally, and actively seeking by skilful mediation to prevent Russia from rushing blindly into war—herself determined not to risk a ship in so base a cause; and, on the other, Germany, reticent and extremely anxious, fearful lest Russia should appeal to her new friend for help—which, in the circumstances, she, too, would have refused. How real was Germany's fear of war and European complications during the crisis may be gauged from her cringing attitude, official and public, towards Russia, when it was discovered that the German trawler, "Sonntag," of Geestemünde, had also been favored with the attentions of Russian quick-firing guns, and had only escaped the fate of the Hull trawler, "Crane," by cutting her nets and making off as speedily as possible. Though the affair was duly reported, the entire German press, which valiantly thundered against the Russians for firing at English ships, for three days suppressed all mention of the insult to their own flag, until the welcome news came from England that a peaceful solution had been arrived at, when the "incident" was casually referred to without the slightest trace of indignation or resentment. Even the Pan-German organs betrayed no umbrage; while the Government not only took no notice whatever, but positively stated that it had no intention of lodging even the mildest of verbal protests with the Russian Government. This lick-spittle attitude was, of course, dictated by purely political considerations, and deservedly earned the gratitude of the Tsar; for there can be no doubt that had Germany associated herself with England, as she has shown herself so willing to do in similar cases in the past where minor States, such as Venezuela, are concerned, and cheap glory without personal danger is preassured, Russia would have found herself in a still more serious predicament. That Germany did not do so, but deliberately contributed to support Russia's already indefensible position, by carefully abstaining from making known or pressing her own claim for reparation, is a point that should be carefully noted, if only because it shows, as the Socialist organ, "*Vorwaerts,*" with grim humor pointed out, that, since Bismarck's day, "We Germans fear God only—and the Tsar."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A few words must be said about the Lippe-Detmold controversy, which, besides being of considerable constitutional and dynastic importance and a unique specimen of a "*querelle Allemande*" in which all Germans take an almost passionate interest, throws an instructive side light upon the character of the German Emperor, and contemporary German history.

On March 20, 1895, the reigning Prince Waldemar of Lippe-Detmold died without issue, thereby necessitating the institution of a Regency, as his legitimate successor, his youngest brother, Alexander, then aged sixty-five, was, and still is, insane. By an edict, promulgated October, 1890, the late Prince Waldemar had nominated, for the office of Regent, Prince Adolphus of Schaumburg-Lippe, a younger brother of the present reigning Prince of that principality, whose family claim to be the nearest agnates to the princely line of Lippe-Detmold, and consequently to be entitled to the ultimate succession to that throne. Now, Prince Adolphus of Schaumburg-Lippe was married to the Emperor's sister, the Princess Victoria of Prussia, having, as it has since transpired, obtained her hand from the Emperor on the express mutual understanding that his family should ultimately secure the Lippe-Detmold succession. And, in accordance with the terms of the edict, Prince Adolphus, in March, 1895, assumed the Regency. Meanwhile, a powerful claimant arose in the person of Count Ernest of Lippe-Biesterfeld; and so popular was his claim that, to avoid further friction, with the consent of all parties the question was submitted to a Court of Arbitration composed of six members of the Supreme Court of the Empire, with the late King of Saxony as president. On June 27th, 1897, that Court decided in favor of Lippe-Biesterfeld, despite the contention of the Schaumburg line that the claims of Count Lippe-Biesterfeld were vitiated by the fact that the head of the line, his ancestral grandmother, Modeste von Unruh, had belonged to the "*petite noblesse.*" This decision was considered at the time to be final, and Prince Adolphus had to retire from Detmold, Count Ernest of Lippe-Biesterfeld assuming the Regency on July 17th, 1897. Then it was that the Emperor first publicly intervened by means of a telegram in which he said to the retiring Prince Adolphus: "Your Regency has certainly been a blessing. Detmold will never obtain a more worthy lord and lady. Many greetings to Victoria, and my warmest Imperial thanks for the devoted loyalty with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which you administered your office." To this the people of Lippe retorted by a public address to the incoming Regent, saying: "Nobody more worthy can be our sovereign Lord, nobody more worthy our sovereign Lady, then Count Ernest of Lippe-Biesterfeld and his illustrious consort." The verdict of the King of Saxony having established the claims of Lippe-Biesterfeld to the succession, the Schaumburg line then challenged the claims of his descendants, on the ground that the wife of the Regent, who was a Countess von Wartensleben, was the daughter of Mathilde Halbach-Bohlen, who was the child of American parents; the point being that the descendants of an American grandmother were not of good enough birth to sit on the throne of a small German state. Thus, owing to the plebeian births, considerably over a hundred years ago, of the ancestral grandmothers on the male and female sides of the Biesterfeld line, the sons of the Regent were alleged to be incapable of ascending the throne. To quash this contention, the Government of Lippe-Detmold, with the consent of the Diet, enacted a law, March 16th, 1898, nominating the eldest son of Count Lippe-Biesterfeld, Count Leopold, legitimate heir to the Regency. In the same year, the Emperor manifested his displeasure in a remarkable fashion. On the Regent complaining to the Emperor that the officers of the garrison of the Principality declined to address his children as "*Erlaucht*" (Serenity), His Majesty replied in a telegram: "Your letter received. Instructions of Commanding General were issued with my approval. To the Regent what is due to the Regent, nothing more. For the rest, I forbid you, once and for all, to address me in the tone which you have seen fit to use towards me."

This telegram aroused widespread indignation in Germany, where it was universally condemned. Then for six years there was a lull in the controversy, until September 26th of this year, when the Regent, Count Ernest of Lippe-Biesterfeld, who for nearly thirty years had been a permanent invalid, and during his reign had acquired universal respect and admiration, died, leaving the office of Regent to his son Leopold, a young officer in the German army. In dutiful respect, the son immediately informed the Emperor of the death of his father, and ere nightfall received the following telegraphic reply: "I express my sympathy at the death of your father. As the legal situation is by no means

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cleared up, I cannot accept the assumption on your part of the Regency, nor can I permit the soldiers to take the oath of allegiance."

The effect of this singular telegram of condolence was electrical. Apart from its harsh, almost indecent, tone at such a moment, the telegram, which bore the signature "William I. R.," was an unconstitutional act, as all Imperial edicts, to be valid, must be accompanied by the signature of the Chancellor. Moreover, by refusing to allow the troops of the Principality to take the oath of allegiance, the Emperor established an anarchical condition, contrary to all military precedent and constitutional usage; while his description of the legal situation as "not cleared up" denoted nothing more nor less than an arbitrary infringement upon accepted law and authority—namely, the law enacted by the Lippe Government in 1898. Lastly, it flouted the dignity of the Chancellor, who was called upon to resign, or offer explanations. The outcry was so great that the Chancellor, who is an adept in the art of explaining his Imperial master's words and actions, issued what he styled an "authentic interpretation" of the telegram, in which, in bad German, he repudiated the idea that the Emperor intended to interfere, and promised that the Lippe question should be settled on its own merits by the law. With this promise the matter now stands; the son of the Regent, Count Leopold, maintaining the Regency. It now only remains to add that, immediately after the death of the Regent, the Lippe Diet made known the text of a secret agreement, signed in 1886 between Prince Waldemar of Lippe and Prince George of Schaumburg-Lippe, to which all the agnates of the Schaumburg line appended their signatures, whereby, on the demise of Prince Waldemar, Prince Adolphus of Schaumburg-Lippe was to succeed to the Regency. Needless to say, this revelation of the unscrupulousness and duplicity of the Schaumburg line still further alienated sympathy from their cause; and it now looks, as the whole question is to be once more submitted to the decision of a Special Court of the Federal Council, as if the Biesterfeld line, after all, will be adjudicated lawful heirs to the succession. Such, in outline, is the history of the controversy, which Bismarck, as long ago as 1895, declared to be settled in favor of Lippe-Biesterfeld. Germans feel so passionately about it, because they realize that the Emperor has not shrunk from resorting to personal abuse, chicanery,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intrigue, arbitrary and unconstitutional misuse of his sovereign power, in order to harry an infirm, but worthy and enlightened, old Count and his son out of a position assigned to them by law, hereditary right, and popular acclamation, and put his sister and her consort in their place, on the throne of Lippe-Detmold.

ST. PETERSBURG, *November, 1904.*

THE signs of the period are many and ominous, the shadows of coming events dark and weird, for Russia is seething with discontent, burning with shame, tortured by doubt. The peoples who acknowledge the sway of the Tsar are growing, mentally and morally, not by months or weeks, but by days and hours. The scales are falling from their eyes; their consciousness is keener, more intense, their impulse to action is becoming irresistible. From time to time vast multitudes of unwashed, dishevelled, ragged, lean human beings, with no work, no food, no part to play in this world but that of slowly quitting it, rise up wildly and burn the hay, the corn, the houses of the wealthy, especially in the south. Thousands of recruits, with nothing to eat but plenty of alcohol to drink, gut shops, rifle private dwellings, attack the police. Army officers eagerly read seditious pamphlets and forbidden journals, and openly talk "treason," which consists in making a sharp distinction between Russia and her Tsar. Priests prepare for a new era of Church history. Noblemen make common cause with peasants against the caprices of the autocracy, and even courtiers find fault with the dynasty.

In a word, Russia's institutions, political and religious, her social order, her foreign and domestic policy, and even her form of government, are in the crucible, and no man can foretell the shapes which they will assume when they finally emerge thence. Contrasts are extreme to the point of grotesqueness; currents and back-eddies meet, clash and revolve in whirlpools; disorder swells and spreads to the verge of chaos. On one side we see a Government composed of ministers lacking power, initiative, insight and courage, behind whom flit shadowy forms of imperial Grand-Dukes—pullers of the wires which move the entity known as Russia. On the other side, we behold a people bereft of its substance, shorn of its strength, blinded like Samson, and set to grind in its prison house for the support or delectation of the Philistines.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And the likeness between the Russian people and the Hebrew strong man may be further justified by wild happenings in the near future.

Foreigners are bewildered by what they see and hear, and stand puzzled like a country schoolmaster before Egyptian hieroglyphics. For we live in a period of transition. The newspapers are beginning cautiously to condemn the past, to criticise the present, and to claim a voice in ordering the future; yet foreign books, newspapers and reviews are cut, blackened, suppressed by the censor, while the country is flooded with leaflets and proclamations secretly printed and zealously circulated. Literary men meet in private and discuss the coming change of régime; secret conferences are held which resemble the meetings of Girondins and Jacobins in eighteenth-century Paris. Rich men refuse to tax themselves on the demand of the Court, which has not set them an example; just as peasants have to be driven by force from their huts to the barracks, by the order of Grand-Dukes who refuse to quit their palaces. The nation demands peace; the rulers who shun the battlefield order war to the knife, and further insist on hampering the action of the troops. For the operations of army and navy are directed by the "Most High," as the Tsar is officially termed in the jargon of Byzantium, while responsibility for failure is fixed upon the Generals and Admirals who are thus obliged to act against their better judgment. Far from being disconcerted by reverses at the front, the dynasty and its unofficial advisers continue to provoke Great Britain and the United States by arbitrary contraband regulations and murderous attacks on harmless fishermen; while, in the eyes of the thinking section of the people, the myriads of slain and wounded, and the vast crowd of their half-famished brethren slowly dying at home, assume the form of spectral monsters like the ghosts that appeared to Richard III. Such is the condition of Russia as it presents itself from within. Seen from without it is less alarming.

Viewed from that angle of vision, hopes of peace, doubts of victory and rumors of mediation characterize the situation. True, foreign diplomatists and Government journals solemnly assure their hearers and readers that the Tsar's subjects are athirst for vengeance and eager to carry on the struggle to the death. But those who have even a slight acquaintance with the masses know that the contrary is the truth. The Russian people are heartily

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sick of the war, which crushes them as no previous campaign ever did. They have had no enthusiasm for it from the outset. For the benighted peasant knows nothing of Manchuria, and feels no impulse to sacrifice the welfare of his family and his own life for the purpose of wresting it from Japan or China. Still, the word of the Tsar was a law to him; and, so long as it was believed that the Russian army would have but to advance in order to drive the enemy before it like sheep, there were few murmurs. But defeat brought reflection, criticism, discontent; and the practical consequences of a long series of retreats opened the eyes of the common man to the fact that it is he and his like who have to bear the brunt of the war, for the sake, not of his fatherland, but of the few privileged personages to whom it is bringing wealth, position, honors and decorations.

For the first time in Russian history the meaning of war has been brought home to the minds of the masses. During the Turkish campaign, its pressure was hardly felt. The law of universal conscription was then only in its embryonic stage, and the contributions of men made by any particular area were quite insignificant. At present, mobilization takes place in vast districts and populous cities, and the men come in crowds wrathful and murmuring. Merchants, officials, clerks, teachers, actors, farmers are summoned from their homes and ordered to cut every tie of kindred, friendship, business, and set out to kill or be killed. There is no discharge in this war. In vain, wives, sisters, brides and daughters fall on their knees in the mud imploring Generals, Privy Councillors and even the Tsar himself, to spare the bread-winner. Fate is not more inexorable. There is only one issue and many take it: suicide. Here, several youths blow their brains out; there, men throw themselves from the upper stories of high houses; in another place, a whole family swallows poison. A few lie down on the rails in front of the trains; many run away; some go mad. Women give birth to dead children in the square where the recruits foregather. Weeping and mourning are universal. Nor is death the worst to be feared. The tortures of the wounded are known to be maddening. Private letters have come from men who lay for forty-eight hours in the field, with festering wounds and parching thirst, forgotten. No wonder that the murmurs of the peasants waxed loud in some places, and became mutiny in others.

Men and priests were sent about the country to fan the embers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of patriotism in the peasant breast. "Our Little Father," they said, "desires to win Manchuria for his children, but the treacherous Japanese are trying to prevent him." But the Russian boors shrewdly made answer: "New land will be useless to us if we lose our lives. There is plenty in Russia, if only we were allowed to till it in peace. As for Manchuria, we know that it is the graveyard of tens of thousands of our brothers. We got on without it under other Tsars, and we do not want it now."

The working-men in cities are still more opposed to the war, for it deals them a much more cruel blow. Even those who are not drafted to the army are thrown out of work and deprived of bread. Of Jews alone, there are over 20,000 men in the Warsaw district in receipt of one pound of dry bread daily from the wealthier members of their community. Other districts of Poland are no better off. And Poland is but a part of the Empire. Those working-men can and do read, and what embitters them most in the newspapers are the oft-repeated boasts of the Government that the available gold reserves are greater now than ever. "The people are famished, while the Autocracy rolls in wealth," they remark. "Autocracy and people are greater enemies than Russia and Japan."

The intelligent classes, too, distinguish between fatherland and dynasty, patriotism and servility; and not without reason. Their best representatives are in fortresses, in prisons, in Siberia or in the coldest parts of northern Russia. Some of them, it is true, have lately been forgiven, but the acts or words for which they were punished are still treated as crimes, and the ex-criminals may at any moment be condemned again without trial or indictment. Their disaffection has already assumed the form of opposition to the war and, very often, of sympathy with Japan. The press has noticed this sentiment and condemned it. Although not surprised myself, I more than once argued the point from curiosity. "After all," I objected, "the Japanese are your enemies; and, if you find anything to admire in them, it can only be their love of country." "Quite so," was the answer I most frequently received. "They have a country, and they love and serve it; whereas we have not. They are fighting for their nation, while we are dying for a group of privileged persons who treat the Russian people as their enemies. The Japanese, being the enemies of our enemies, are therefore in a certain sense our friends."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These feelings, gathering strength as they spread, are being transmuted into popular passion. A section of the press, profiting by the dismay of the Government, gives them utterance, sometimes clearly, emphatically, brutally. Here is a symptomatic instance of plain speaking. Prince Trubetskoy, who occupies a chair in the Imperial University of Kieff, complains that Russia had been sleeping for generations and is now awakened by Japan, who has humiliated her pride and revealed her weakness:

"Who is to blame for that? The Russian people? But the Russian people slept by order of the authorities. And for many years all conceivable measures were adopted to keep them from awakening. When, from time to time, any one seemed about to rise up and speak in a human voice, he was held to be disturbing public order and endangering public safety. And the warning order was heard: 'Silence! Lie quiet!' while a brawny arm thrust down the raised head. For many years past, Russia has resembled a dormitory in a police station."

That is plain speaking with a vengeance, and it is the expression of the thoughts and feelings of nearly a hundred millions.

That the really religious classes in Russia should feel no enthusiasm for the war is only what one would expect. Their kingdom is not of this world. But what is more significant and surprising is that they, too, are in opposition to the Government which continues the war. For they are never immune from persecution, never free to save their souls in their own way. What most of them teach is that God has greater power and, therefore, stronger claims to obedience than the Tsar, and that His behests must be fulfilled whenever they conflict with an Imperial ukase. The Government, discouraging comparisons which set the Tsar below any being—even the Almighty—sends the men who institute such either to prison or to the madhouse.

The most fateful phenomenon of all, however, is the falling away of the Russian merchants. A close caste for many generations, the trading guild still forms a social island in the Tsardom of to-day. Peculiar views, ancient customs, secular traditions, quaint proverbs, distinguish them from every other section of the community. But the one trait which every merchant possessed, and which clung to him even when he lost the religious faith of his fathers, was unbounded devotion to the Tsar, and readiness to spend money generously on any object recommended by his Majesty. But now even the Moscow merchants have buttoned up

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their pockets. The recent experience of Morozoff, perhaps the wealthiest merchant in Russia, has been so extensively described in the daily press that I need only say that it illustrates the situation well. The authorities, growing alarmed, inspired the newspapers to shame the merchants into generosity; and articles were published branding the industrial millionaires as "savages," "the progeny of highwaymen," "pirates," and "beasts of prey." But independent journalists made answer that the nabobs of Russia are right. Like the peasants, they are nullities in their fatherland. They pay hundreds of thousands of dollars in direct taxes to the state, they give employment to scores of thousands of workmen, they subscribe enormous sums to hospitals—in a word, they are a force in the country. Yet all the part such a merchant plays is that of a milch cow to the Treasury; and, as the cow is expected to give milk, not to low, so the merchant is expected to pay money down, not to open his mouth even if there be anything wrong and he can set it right. A merchant is not admitted into good society. He is the employer of a hundred impecunious noblemen to whom he pays mere nickels, yet the children of these mendicants are privileged to enter into special high schools and become Ministers of State, while his own children have no such rights. If a merchant's son wants to become a naval officer, he must go to England or Japan.

Even the army and navy, or rather many of their best representatives, are against the war. Why? Because the Government is not giving either service fair play. Admiral Skrydloff may be an admirable commander, despite his unpopularity; but his appointment was the result of a mistake made by a Grand-Duke. General Kuropatkin is not allowed to have any initiative. Each of Kuropatkin's advances against the Japanese was undertaken by orders from St. Petersburg. His celebrated "order of the day" to his soldiers was dictated, word for word, from the capital; and he had to sign it or resign.

All Russia is calling for internal reforms, and the Government answers that there is no money available. The campaign swallows it all up. Already the finances are suffering from the strain; the gold standard is imperilled; the economic condition of the masses is wretched beyond words; and as a direct consequence autocracy itself is in danger. Another serious Russian defeat in Manchuria, together with the fall of Port Arthur, would, I feel

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

convinced, provoke such a popular resolve to put an end to the meaningless struggle that the Tsar would be obliged to call in representatives of the Zemstvos, and authorize his representatives to open negotiations with Japan with a view to making peace.

But so long as there are victories, real or apparent, to buoy up the hopes of the War Party and to silence the murmurs of the people, peace proposals will not be entertained, nor domestic reforms introduced. For the governing group of Grand-Dukes has learned nothing from the campaign, and forgotten nothing during its progress. There is a new Minister of the Interior, Sviatopolk Mirsky, a smooth-tongued, enlightened and well-meaning man, who is quite ready to comply with the reasonable demands of the people. He has done much to prove his willingness to compromise with the new spirit which now prevails. Thus he connives at outspoken articles in newspapers, and he has pardoned several of the highly respected men whom his predecessor had banished or imprisoned without trial. But, having gone thus far, he has come to a standstill. For he is invested with no power but that of making vague promises and patriotic exhortations. In the two Russian capitals and other cities university students are being arrested and their lodgings searched at night. The army of spies is not only maintained, but increased. The secret body-guard of the Emperor has been more than doubled.

Abroad, too, the old programme is the same. Russia has carried her point of including raw cotton and consignments of metal to Japan in the list of contraband of war. That was a weapon levelled against Japanese industry on the one hand and British and American trade on the other. The pretext is that raw cotton could be employed in the manufacture of guncotton. Everybody in the army knows, however, that a single consignment of raw cotton would suffice to make enough of the explosive to blow up half Russia. But Japan needs cotton for her spindles, which number over a million, and Russia's object is to paralyze that industry. Japan imports metals worth fifteen million dollars, and for American petroleum she pays annually five millions. Out of a total import trade of $131,490,000 some fifty-nine millions' worth is arbitrarily declared contraband.

In the Middle East, Russia is equally active. In spite of the arrangement between her and England, she seems determined to enter into close relations with the Afghans, to "study" their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country, to keep consuls and to obtain exclusive concessions there. Already official proposals have been sent to the Amir, whose reply is silence; they were twice forwarded with no tangible result. Russia is ready to enforce them in other ways; and officials here hint at the line that will be adopted, by instancing Great Britain's action in Tibet.

The animus felt against Great Britain could not be more frankly exhibited than in the unjustifiable attack delivered by Russian warships upon harmless fishermen in the North Sea. If there had been only the two ships which sank, no word of their fate might ever have gone abroad. And what happened to a flotilla in the North Sea may well occur on the high seas to detached ships. High-handed acts like these make one call to mind the massacres of Blagoveshtshensk and of Taku during the Russian Expedition against the Boxers, the cold-blooded shooting of the Japanese troops before their transport was blown out of existence and the sinking of the "Hipsang" and the "Knight Commander."

The mass of the Russian people ought not to be held responsible for those cruelties. They will be discouraged and forbidden whenever the nation becomes arbiter of its own destinies. For injustice at home and abroad is the work of a court camarilla, not of the much-suffering Russian people.

WASHINGTON, *November, 1904.*

WE do not purpose here to discuss from the view-point of internal politics the amazing outcome of the Presidential election —amazing, because Mr. Roosevelt carried not only all the Northern and Western States, but also three of the former Slave States, Delaware, West Virginia and Missouri, besides securing a part of Maryland's electoral votes; but rather to indicate how the result is, and should be, regarded by well-informed and thoughtful men in foreign countries. By way of preface, however, we may glance at two or three incidents of the election, which, although ostensibly relating, not to international, but to domestic affairs, really throw some light upon the question, sure to be mooted in European capitals, whether the Republican triumph is likely to be repeated four years hence. One thing is settled by the self-denying declaration which Mr. Roosevelt made when he learned of his victory: the Republicans will lack in 1908 the ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vantage of possessing in their standard-bearer a universally known, picturesque, forceful and magnetic personality. Many things may happen in four years, but the emergence from the Republican ranks of a second Theodore Roosevelt is extremely improbable. The Republican party, therefore, must expect to be judged in the next contest by the record which it makes in the coming quadrennium. With the shaping of that record Mr. Roosevelt will have much to do, but it remains to be seen, and is at present doubtful, whether he will be able to control the Senatorial coterie which is committed to the maintenance of the Dingley tariff. That Mr. Roosevelt was supported by a multitude of revisionists, who believed him at heart disposed to favor a reasonable readjustment of the existing customs duties, seems to have been demonstrated by the returns from Massachusetts, which, largely on the issue of revision, chose a Democratic Governor, although it gave the President its electoral votes. If Mr. Roosevelt's influence shall avail to bring about a genuine revision of the tariff, and if he shall use with vigor and effect against law-breaking trusts the powers vested in him by the Inter-State Commerce act and the supplemental legislation, it is probable that the opposition will be unable to make the next campaign pivot on the Trusts and Tariff issues. In that event the Republican party seems likely to retain ascendency for an extended period, especially if, during the next four years, it should succeed in widening the breach already made in the "Solid South." The startling fact that Missouri was carried by the Republicans suggests that, if Mr. Roosevelt had maintained toward the Southern States the conciliatory policy adopted by his predecessor, there would have been some hope of detaching Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee and Arkansas from the Democratic column. Even in Louisiana, the so-called "Lily-White" Republicans were becoming a formidable organization, when irritation at the Booker Washington, Crum and other similar incidents caused them virtually to disband. In view of the result in Missouri, it is conceivable that Mr. Roosevelt, if he took measures to check the revival of the race issue, might put his party in a position to obtain in 1906 more Representatives from the Southern States than the Democracy could get from the Northern. Under such circumstances, it would be hard to see how the Democrats could look forward to recovering control of the Lower House of the Federal Legislature. That they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cannot regain for many years to come the preponderance in the Senate which they enjoyed for a brief season in Mr. Cleveland's second term is indisputable. They may, on the other hand, count with some confidence on electing a President and a majority of the House of Representatives, if the Republican party's treatment of the Trusts and the Tariff shall fail to satisfy the masses of the people. As regards, in a word, the permanence of the Republican triumph, no forecast is practicable, until we learn what course Mr. Roosevelt will adopt with regard to the two capital issues in internal politics.

The primary grounds of the interest with which our Presidential campaign was watched in Europe and the Far East are obvious: they have to do with our foreign policy, and with our power of enforcing it by naval and military strength, or of promoting it by alliances or friendly understandings. The facts that Mr. Roosevelt will be President for another term, and that Mr. Hay will continue to be his Secretary of State, are, naturally, accepted as guarantees that there will be no divergence from the positions taken by our State Department during the last three years. There has never been any foundation for the campaign charge that Mr. Roosevelt was inclined to entangle the United States in foreign complications. The despatch of warships to San Domingo, to Tangiers, to Beirut and to Smyrna was a legitimate means of exerting pressure upon delinquent and refractory States which had paid no heed to the diplomatic presentation of just demands. What is our navy for, if not to assure considerate and equitable treatment to our citizens in foreign parts? Unquestionably, Mr. Roosevelt has had more than one pretext for involving us in international imbroglios. He has availed himself of none of them. Our attitude toward China in the matter of the indemnity exacted for the Boxer outrages was a model of forbearance and disinterestedness. There is reason to believe that, but for the influence exerted by our State Department, the indemnity would have been materially larger and the terms of payment more onerous. It is now tolerably certain that, had an inordinate amount of money been claimed from China, the Pekin Government would have renounced the hope of paying it, and the Powers concerned would have found themselves confronted with a revolution throughout the Middle Kingdom. Great Britain would gladly have seen our State Department a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party to the treaty by which England bound herself to assist Japan in certain contingencies. Some specious reasons might have been advanced for such participation on our part: for instance, through our possession of the Philippines we have become an Asiatic Power, and, as such, we were interested in averting the outbreak of war in the Far East. Moreover, had our Government become a signatory of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty, it is improbable that Russia would have defied Japan. As a matter of fact, the United States have remained scrupulously neutral in the contest which began last February, and the end of which is problematical. Again, President Roosevelt was invited to act as umpire in the dispute between Venezuela and the three blockading Powers, and also to decide the question whether, in the distribution of Venezuelan revenues, set aside for the payment of foreign debts, a preference should be given to countries which had resorted to force, over those which had confined themselves to diplomatic representations. Here was a tempting opportunity of giving the Monroe Doctrine a status in international law; for, by their proposal, not only Great Britain, Germany and Italy, but the other creditor Powers, had evinced a willingness formally to recognize the hegemony of the United States over the Latin-American republics. Not only did Mr. Roosevelt decline the seductive invitation, but he procured the reference of all European demands against Venezuela to The Hague Tribunal.

Deserving of more attention, also, than it received during the campaign was the conclusion of an arbitration treaty between the United States and France. Like the preceding convention between France and England, to which it closely conforms, the treaty excludes from arbitration such controversies as in the judgment of either signatory affect its national honor or vital interests. It is, however, the Executive, not the Legislature, by which such judgment will be exercised, and, consequently, the pressure to be feared from popular excitement will be minimized. The treaty is not an isolated exhibition of a peace-loving spirit, made for campaign purposes. It is but the first of a series which, when completed, will establish similar relations with almost all the Powers of the European Continent, binding us and them to accept arbitration in lieu of war, except in cases of exceptional gravity. It is understood that the series will be crowned with an arbitration treaty between the United States and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Great Britain. There is reason to believe that every one of these beneficent conventions will receive the needed two-thirds vote in the Senate. It is true that the Olney-Pauncefote Arbitration Treaty was rejected by that body, but an extraordinary change has since taken place in American sentiment. The lingering suspicion with which Great Britain was still regarded by many of our citizens eight years ago, has been almost entirely dispelled. Of the vindictiveness, for which the lurid accounts of the Revolutionary struggle and of the War of 1812 in our school histories were responsible, there remains scarcely any trace. The sympathetic attitude of the British Government during the two months preceding and throughout our war with Spain, sharply contrasted, as it was, with the ill-disguised antipathy of Continental Europe, went far to efface the memory of far-distant quarrels. If the Senate shall reflect the altered temper of the American people—generally in foreign affairs it is a faithful mirror—it will reverse its former action, and welcome the opportunity of minimizing the chances of collision between the sections of the English-speaking world. At all events, Mr. Roosevelt will have done his part when he shall have submitted a cluster of arbitration treaties to the Senate. He will then have given conclusive proof that the "big stick" which he believes in carrying is not the bludgeon of a bully, but a purely defensive weapon.

If any voices refrained from joining in the chorus of felicitation with which Mr. Roosevelt's success has been greeted by foreign diplomatists, they are those of the representatives of Latin-American republics. Silence on their part was, perhaps, to be expected in view of the President's letter, which was read at the Cuban dinner. We should like to believe that the letter was hastily penned, and that the author did not intend his words to bear the construction which on their face they justify. Until we see the declaration formulated in a message to Congress, we shall persist in hoping that the President cannot have meant to assert that the United States should assume toward our sister commonwealths the function of debt-collector in the interests of foreign Powers. There is also a widespread and growing sentiment among far-sighted Americans that it is difficult to reconcile with the essence of the Monroe Doctrine the precedent lately established in the case of Venezuela. We refer to the fact that, with the countenance of our Government, or, at all events, with-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out any known protest on its part, nearly a third of the customs revenues of La Guayra and Puerto Cabello have been set aside for the payment, not merely of damages due for public wrongs, but also of private debts arising out of contracts. Suppose that the fraction of the customs dues thus sequestrated had been not thirty, but sixty, or even ninety per cent.! Is it not clear that, under such circumstances, Venezuela would be reduced practically to the condition of Egypt? We ourselves have never yet paid the debts due to British merchants which the Congress of the Confederation pledged our States to pay by the treaty of peace concluded in 1783. Shall we admit that on that account Great Britain has against us a standing *casus belli?* It goes without saying that every Latin-American republic should be held to a rigorous account for any insult offered to the flag or the official representatives of a foreign Power, or for any act of violence committed against the person or property of a foreign individual. Reparation for such wrongs may undoubtedly be secured by the temporary occupation of seaports and custom-houses. We suffered Great Britain to apply such a remedy in the case of Nicaragua. That, however, is plainly a different thing from conniving at the confiscation of a republic's indispensable revenue for the liquidation of ordinary debts.

That the United States will have a navy commensurate with the magnitude of their commercial interests may be looked upon as definitely settled by Mr. Roosevelt's triumph at the ballot-box. It now seems probable that, by the end of the President's second term, Congress will have authorized the construction of a navy second only to England's own. That is to say, our strength upon the ocean, which is believed already to surpass Germany's, will exceed even that of France. That no expansion of the regular army need be looked for under Mr. Roosevelt may be inferred from the fact that, although the authorized *cadre,* or framework, is capable of instant adjustment to a hundred thousand soldiers, only about sixty thousand are at present enlisted. Fair-minded men will acknowledge that the existing number is nearly, if not quite, the minimum which should be maintained permanently under the colors, now that we have given hostages to fortune in the shape of Porto Rico, Hawaii, Guam, Samoa and the Philippines.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED